

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

PROFESSOR J. ALEXANDER FINDLAY of Didsbury College has published the substance of twenty-one years' English New Testament lectures. The lectures cover most of the ground of the New Testament and follow a certain scheme, into which, however, the author has not attempted to fit the Epistle of Jude, the Pastoral Epistles, Second and Third John, the Second Epistle of Peter, or the Apocalypse. These books seem to him to be of historical rather than theological or experimental importance.

The lectures do not form an 'Introduction' in the full sense of the term to the books of the New Testament that are dealt with. Questions of date and authorship are secondary from the author's standpoint; what is primary is the subject-matter. And the endeavour is made to remove misunderstanding and bring out salient points, much reliance being placed here and there on a re-arrangement of the verses.

The volume bears the title, *The Way, the Truth and the Life* (Hodder & Stoughton; 15s. net), and this title provides a direct clue to the idea which the author seeks to work out. Here is the burden of the book: 'There are *three* chief types of Christian thought and experience, all found perfectly expressed in the New Testament, for it not only contains, but unifies them all. All are Christian, because all are centred upon the person and work of Christ, and all find their final meeting-place in the First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel, which I take to be the latest of the greater books of the New Testament.'

What, then, are the three chief types of Christian thought and experience to which the author refers? They may be summed up as the 'way' ('in His steps'), the 'truth' ('learn of Me'), and the 'life' ('in Christ'). But the order in which they are presented in his book is not the Scriptural order; it is 'way,' 'life,' 'truth.'

The first type may be associated with Peter. It is expressed in the First Epistle of Peter, the Gospel of Luke, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, where it receives its richest intellectual formulation. The characteristic thought of these books is that Jesus is the Way. As He followed the path of obedience to His Father's will to the end, so He calls us to follow Him, which involves our becoming 'strangers and pilgrims' in this world and pressing to the goal of His 'appearing.' This stream runs out to sea in the Fourth Gospel, where Jesus says, 'If any man serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be.'

The second type, which emphasises not so much the imitation of Christ as possession by His Spirit, may be associated with Paul, whose life as a Christian began, not with a call to follow Jesus, but with a vision of the Risen Lord who had 'apprehended'—caught and possessed—him. The thought of Jesus as the Life is expressed not only in Paul but in the Gospel of Mark. For Mark Jesus is the God-possessed man. His life, death, and resurrection are an act of God. All the emphasis in Mark, as in Paul, is laid on God's work in the soul. This stream also runs out to sea in the First Epistle of

John and the Fourth Gospel ('Abide in me, and I in you').

The third type of Christian thought and experience dwells rather on the words of Jesus. It is principally to be found in that book of the Sayings of the Lord (the document called Q) which underlies our First and Third Gospels. We find it also in the Epistle of James and in the contribution of the First Evangelist. In these sources of our Christian religion Jesus appears as the Truth. It is not so much by following His example, or being possessed by His Spirit, as by sitting at His feet and learning His words that we find rest to our souls. For His words are 'spirit and life.' This stream also runs out to sea in the First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel, where Jesus is the 'Word Incarnate.'

We may gather from the above in what order Dr. FINDLAY discusses the New Testament documents, and that his discussion is based on well-defined critical views. But only the perusal of the book could open up to us the wealth of critical and exegetical matter which it contains. There will be many besides former students of Didsbury College who will turn to its pages for help and stimulus.

Perhaps it is to be regretted that there is no index of Scripture references, long undoubtedly as it would have been. The busy preacher or teacher would have found such an index useful, especially as the Scriptures of the New Testament are not handled here in their canonical order, nor even in the order of their appearance, but in conformity with the special idea or thesis (interesting and suggestive, as it must be allowed) of which the work is an elaboration.

What Dr. FINDLAY means when he speaks of the streams running out to sea in the First Epistle of John and the Fourth Gospel is literally expressed by him towards the close of the work. John, as he says, brought Peter, Paul, and Matthew together, and focused all they had seen upon the person of Jesus of Nazareth. To them Jesus showed the way, told the truth, brought the life; to John He was Himself the 'way, the truth, and the life.'

Sir Richard GREGORY, Bart., F.R.S., has written a very imposing but somewhat disappointing book, *Religion in Science and Civilization* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net). The book abounds in facts, ideas, and theories, but instead of being marshalled in support of an orderly argument they come swarming on in a bewildering mob. It is almost as if the contents of a gigantic commonplace book had been emptied out on the pages. This impression is increased by the illustrations which are scattered through the book with no regard to the letterpress.

When one ranges in this encyclopædic way through all the ages, sciences, religions, and civilizations, errors and superficial judgments are unavoidable. We note a reference to Yuan Shi Kai which is so inapplicable that one can only suppose it to be an error for Sun Yat Sen. The Church of Scotland is casually referred to as a branch of English Non-conformity! The opposition to Robertson Smith is dismissed as 'bigotry and prejudice,' though it is added that the tide so far turned that in a few years Smith was able to lecture in 'Aberdeen itself.' This despite the fact that the Church, while condemning Smith, expressly safeguarded the right of critical research, and that Aberdeen was enthusiastically behind Smith from first to last.

On the other hand, it must be emphasised that a most friendly spirit towards religion runs through the book. The writer points out, what is too often forgotten, that the conflict has not been between religion and science, but more correctly between obscurantism and enlightenment. Authorities in science and religion have often stood shoulder to shoulder against the advance of new ideas. No doctor over forty, it was said, accepted Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood. Planck in our time has complained that the older physicists refused even to look at his Quantum Theory.

The view widely held in literary and other intellectual circles was that 'men of science are materialists insensitive to beauty and incapable of deep emotion. They are believed to be blind to everything that makes life worth living to other people, and to know nothing of the artist's raptures

or of the hopes and despairs of passionate natures. In the great company of prophets, seers, and poets they are given no place.' That this view is now passing away is due to the fact that 'mechanistic principles no longer dominate scientific thought.' Religion and science are in reality intertwined. They are the warp and woof of the fabric of civilization. In the service of high ideals they meet on common ground, and may be made sources of social good.

Much is said in this connexion which is both true and wholesome. But one must demur at the vagueness with which religion is conceived. It must be entirely undogmatic, a completely fluid body of ideas, subject like scientific theories to a continual process of evolutionary change. 'Science,' said Huxley, 'commits suicide when it adopts a creed.' And similarly, in Sir Richard's view, 'there is really no finality in a Christian creed.' Even belief in the personality of God is not an essential. A certain ultimate consensus of religious sentiment and moral endeavour is envisaged. 'Different individuals and communities require different doctrines and rituals to bind them together in worship of any kind, but all such formularies are only ancillary aids to a universal faith in the possibility of ascending towards the highest good by human endeavour. It is on this principle that all great religions should be able to unite with the common purpose of promoting whatever may be called divine in the nature of man.'

But is science itself so completely undogmatic? Must every question be for ever an open question? Can nothing be predicated with final assurance? Must judgment be held in perpetual suspense? Let us make every allowance for the fact that all human formulations must be inadequate to express reality. Let us freely admit that thinkers in every department, and especially theologians, have been all too prone to dogmatism, and have multiplied beyond all reason the articles of their creeds. Yet there must be some firm foundations in the world of thought which stand unmoved amid the flux of things, some truths of eternal value, truths to which a man may pledge his soul to live by them and to die for them.

In the field of history surely there are truths which have been finally determined. Certain events did or did not happen, and in regard to them further suspense of judgment is pedantic. It may be said that there is no mathematical certainty. Even the existence of Napoleon has been called in question. But probability is the guide of action, and it may amount to practical certainty. Now Christianity is a historic religion, and it bases itself on the great affirmation that Christ did suffer under Pontius Pilate and rose again on the third day. Sir Richard GREGORY regards the historical evidence as 'scarcely convincing,' but while he speaks in the language of scientific reserve his position is as dogmatic as the Christian affirmation, for it amounts to a practical denial that the Resurrection ever did happen.

In his own field of science Sir Richard doubtless holds firmly the dogma of the rationality of the universe. Einstein has said that if he did not believe in the regularity of Nature's sequences he would cease forthwith to take any interest in physics, and Schrödinger goes so far as to affirm that 'even if Nature is really irrational, we could never, never believe it. Science cannot possibly be given up.' No theologian could possibly be more dogmatic.

In the realm of ethics, too, Sir Richard speaks with conviction of 'spiritual values, love of truth and beauty, righteousness, justice and mercy, sympathy with the oppressed, and belief in the brotherhood of man.' These are not debatable, like opinions that are held provisionally, and may, on further enlightenment, be given up.

There is danger of being too dogmatic, but there is also a danger of being too undogmatic and holding all convictions in suspense. With the prevalence of the scientific spirit in our time the latter may be the graver danger. Karl Barth, in addressing Dutch students a year or two ago, said they were doubtless vexed with him for pressing upon them the 'either-or' of existential thinking. They would prefer in days of quiet to play with ideas without committing themselves finally to either side, but in Germany, he warned them, men

had been brought through a crisis to the knife-edge of decision. That crisis has now come upon Holland and upon all the world to try the hearts of men.

Principal Nathaniel MICKLEM of Mansfield College, Oxford, has written a book, *The Creed of a Christian* (S.C.M.; 5s. net), which he describes as 'Monologues upon Great Themes of the Christian Faith.' He disclaims the idea that he is writing either theology or apologetic. But, in effect, the book is very good theology and excellent apologetic. It is popular in the sense that it is easily understood, and it is personal in the sense that the 'Christian' of the title is himself. And it is interesting for both of these reasons.

The earlier chapters have a particular value because they deal with certain aspects of the idea of God which have a relevance to the world-events of our day. Religious people of a certain type are often criticised because of their parochial thought of God. They think that He is concerned about every little event in their drab and wretched lives. They are on the most familiar terms with the Maker of the Universe, know all that is in His mind, use His name as dope in their troubles, and have no sense either of God's Majesty or their own immeasurable insignificance.

The truth in this criticism Dr. MICKLEM takes to be that the wonder of the gospel can best be seen through what is valid in the criticism. The pagan critic has at least a dim sense of Creation. The Christian criticised will know nothing but Redemption. Creation and redemption are the two poles of Christian thought, but Creation comes first. God is Father, but, if His Fatherhood is not interpreted in terms compatible with His Majesty and Power, it is misunderstood. Thought compels us to conceive of One who stands outside the world, a transcendent God, imparting to everything being, life, meaning.

The mistake of the pagan critic is that he does not recognize that there is a gospel in creation. He represents God as so great that it is inconceiv-

able that He should concern Himself with the petty details in the lives of ordinary and undistinguished persons like ourselves. This is perhaps natural, but it is shallow. Does it detract from the glory of God that His interest should extend to the least that He has made? And, if all the universe proceeds from Him by His Word that it may fulfil His purpose and express His thought, how shall He not love everything that has come from Him? And if man is among these creatures of God, is it strange that He should be so interested in him in his sore need as to stretch forth His saving hand to redeem him? Creation comes first, with its disclosure of God's greatness, but Redemption comes after to show what God is like.

But what of the tragedies and disasters and miseries of life? The 'higher pantheism' may be very comforting till we look out on Nature, red in tooth and claw, and on the sufferings she creates. Dr. MICKLEM refers to a 'lamentable article' published in a religious journal and written by a Christian minister in which a drastic solution to such difficulties is proposed. We must restate our theism, he says, and throw overboard lumber that is hindering faith. We cannot believe that the heavenly Father is responsible for floods that drown a million Chinese and infusoria that destroy His innocent children by stealthy infection.

'No living man can hold in his mind and harmonize into one God-consciousness the loving God-Father and the God of the cosmic forces that rule this universe. We do not find His hand in external things, for God is a Spirit, and not responsible for the non-moral and non-spiritual forces of this physical scheme of things. Cowper was not right. God does not plant His footsteps in the sea, and ride upon the storm. God is not in wind, or in the earthquake, or in the influenza, or in the storm, fire, or in the Chinese floods.'

Something may be said for this as the expression of a mood or an emotion. But in reality it is a clear denial of the Christian faith. It postulates two rival gods, the God of Nature and the God of Kindness, the God of Creation and the God of Re-

demption. It finds no support in the words of Jesus. And Dr. MICKLEM sets over against it a noble passage from the Institutes of John Calvin which must be here reproduced for the sheer pleasure of our readers.

‘This is the comfort of the believer to understand that the Heavenly Father doth so embrace all things with His power, that nothing befalleth but by His appointment, and that he is received into God’s keeping, and cannot be touched by any hurt of water or fire or sword, but so far as it shall please God the Governor to give them place. . . . And from hence proceedeth the boldness of the saints. For when they call to mind that the Devil and all the rout of the wicked are so everywhere holden in by the hand of God as with a bridle, that they can neither conceive any mischief against us, nor put it in train when they have conceived it, nor can stir one finger to bring it to pass but so far as He shall suffer, yea, so far as He shall command, and that they are not only holden fast bound with fetters, but also compelled with bridle to do service, here have they abundant springs of consolation.’

That is great writing. It may not offer a satisfying solution of the mystery of evil, but at any rate its doctrine of God is not a shallow one. The one true God, we say, is Creator and Redeemer; if He were not Redeemer, He would not be our Father; if He were not Creator, He would not be God. There is a certain tension or polarity in the Christian faith. Our Lord could see in the transit of the seasons, in bird and flower and family life, the signs of God’s blessed and universal Providence. At the same time, He could speak of a woman as having been bound by Satan these many years.

Here is the paradox—things are as God made them, yet, in so many regards, things are not as they ought to be; nothing can happen apart from the will of God, yet is God’s will flouted every day. It was God’s will, we say, to create a world wherein man must learn through strife and suffering, wherein character must be an attainment and the sins and follies of men must involve others in their issue.

The paradox is seen most acutely in the faith and victory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

He proclaimed God’s fatherly rule over all His creatures, His unconditional charity (sending His rain on good and bad), His accurate interest in us so that the very hairs of our head are numbered. Yet it was in such a world so governed, beneath a Providence so complete and beneficent, that the impossible fate of Jesus Christ happened. Where was the Providence, the protecting hand of God, when Judas betrayed, the disciples fled, and the Lord was left defenceless among His enemies? Here, if ever, God’s will was flouted, and creation shown to be no work of His.

Yet such was not the thought of Jesus Christ Himself: ‘Let this cup pass . . . yet thy will be done . . . Father into thy hands I commend my spirit.’ Here, again, is the paradox—it is not the Father’s will that any of the things should happen to Jesus that did happen—Judas, Peter’s denial, Pilate’s weakness. Yet it was the Father’s will that Christ through His Cross should be victorious and by dying triumph over sin and death. As Calvin says: ‘Had it not been by God’s will that Christ was crucified, where were our salvation?’

Dr. MICKLEM would have us see the true philosophy of history in the Cross of Christ. In this we see how the world is governed. Germany, Russia, Japan may pursue the way of force. Secularism may pursue the economic way of salvation. Atheism may explain the universe without reference to an Author, a fallacious simplicity of view may posit two rival gods, but the Christian faith alone is truly rational. There is mystery all around us, but we shall not find a refuge from it in the vague ideas that make God unreal, inoperative, an alien in His own world. We are all in the hands of God. Apart from His permission no evil can oppress us. In spite of sin and tragedy His purposes stand sure, for He is the God of Redemption as of Creation, and, though the way be hard and mysterious, yet in the end ‘everything in His Temple shall cry Glory.’

The Prophetic Interpretation of History.

II.

BY THE REVEREND G. F. ALLEN, UNION THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE, TALI HSI CHOW.

THE message of the prophets in time of war is not popular. The first steps that lead on the strong path through penitence to reform are never popular. Least of all in time of war is it popular to recognize that the attack of our enemies may be a judgment on our sins, and that there may be faults on our side which we must first reform, before we can hope for peace. It is not surprising that 'Amaziah the priest of Beth-el sent to Jeroboam king of Israel, saying, Amos hath conspired against thee . . . the land is not able to bear all his words' (Am 7¹⁰). A deep-rooted tendency in us all hastily seeks to discuss the sins of our neighbours, whenever there is a danger that our own sins might be exposed. Very naturally, 'Amaziah said unto Amos, O thou seer, go, flee thee away into the land of Judah, and there eat bread, and prophesy there' (Am 7¹²). When Jeremiah first read his prophecies to the king, the latter, we remember, cut them out page by page with a pen-knife and cast them in the fire. He was told, 'Take thee again another roll, and write in it all the former words that were in the first roll' (Jer 36²⁸). Every writer knows how tedious it is to have to copy a manuscript out all over again! Later he meets the charge, which is hardest of all to bear when national feeling runs high, the charge of lack of patriotism. 'Thou fallest away to the Chaldeans,' they say; and 'Let this man, we pray thee, be put to death; forasmuch as he weakeneth the hands of the men of war' (Jer 37¹³ 38⁴). A timid voice in us all shrinks from such unpopularity. We shrink from speaking plainly of the sins in our own community; we think that we are avoiding hurting other people's feelings, though in fact we are merely shrinking from the counter-criticism, which we know such plain speech would cause. When we thus shrink from facing and exposing sin, we come under the charge which Jeremiah raised against the false prophets of his day. 'They have healed also the hurt of my people lightly, saying, Peace, peace; where there is no peace' (Jer 6¹⁴). The only path toward peace is the path of righteousness; and as we follow that path, it is our own sins, and the sins of our own community, which we must first reform. The only path toward the Love of God is the firm, plain dealing with the sins that separate us from that

love; and it is a path which always provokes opposition and persecution in its early stages. If we would heal the evil, each within our own nation, we must be prepared to face the charge that we are unpatriotic in the process. If we cannot face that charge, and prefer a cheaply won popularity, then we come under the condemnation of Christ: 'Woe unto you, when all men shall speak well of you! for in the same manner did their fathers to the false prophets' (Lk 6²⁶). The example of the prophets brings us to the crisis, whether we prefer a cheaply won popularity with an empty ineffectiveness, or a firm dealing with sin and evil together with the cost of opposition and persecution. There is a wise saying of St. Ignatius, 'Christianity is a thing of might whenever it is hated by the world.'

If we are sufficiently humble and sufficiently realist, it will not be difficult to follow the prophets' example with regard to the history of our own day. If we choose we may see the sin of the present war in Europe in the break of faith and the contempt for the rights of smaller nations in Nazi Germany. There is this sin on the side of our enemies; a deeper insight will, however, also quickly reveal the beam in our own eye. The treaties of 1919 lead by an inevitable nemesis to a second war. Within a few years the nations which imposed them found their own trade thrown into confusion, by receiving goods and payments which they did not want. The attempt to hold down a great nation in permanent subjection led by inevitable psychological laws, through which the judgment of God was at work, first to the mood of inferiority and resentment, and then to the rise to power of a demagogue leader, who knew how to make this mood an instrument of his power. If we look to the war in the East, I must speak more carefully, since now it is not my own nation but the country of my adoption which is concerned. There has been sin, both in the Japanese aggression, and in the failure of other nations to stand for the righteousness of God against that aggression, and in China herself. If we are British or American, we must recognize first our own failure to play our part worthily in the East, in defence of international justice. From the side of China, it is only the weaker spirits who spend very much time dwelling on the sins of the

Japanese. On the whole, China has been amazingly free from any bitterness or resentment. The stronger spirits are quick to see in the war a judgment from God, revealing the weakness in their own social organization. There has been in China a conservatism, a slowness to learn from the industrial advance of other nations, a graft that makes public office an occasion for private advance instead of for public service. Through the war China has been learning to face and cure these and other evils in her social life. If China can learn from the war a yet more radical penitence for her social evils, then it may be found in the end that God has done more for China through the Japanese attack, than He could through centuries of sentimental mission preaching, which was too polite to talk about evil and so failed to work its cure. If we turn and think of the Christian fellowship in the world, then again we shall take the war as a judgment from God upon our own sins. In his broadcast address the Archbishop of York also said: 'First of all, as it seems to me, we who are Christians must see in this crisis a judgment upon our failure to be a united and effective fellowship through the world. . . . Our dedication to our Master is so incomplete, our sense of fellowship with one another is so feeble, our perception of responsibility for upholding the standard of Christ is so dim, that in fact the company of Christian people is merged in the several nations of which they are citizens, and we can exert no single and united influence.' If we learn the lessons of the prophets, we shall not waste time judging other nations, but shall say each of our own nation the words of Jeremiah, 'We acknowledge, O Lord, our wickedness, and the iniquity of our fathers: for we have sinned against thee' (Jer 14²⁰). The more we become Biblical and Christian in our thinking, the more shall we learn to say that it is we ourselves who are guilty of the sin of the world, since we have been too weak and ineffective to challenge it and work its cure.

Does that mean that we should not make a stand against the aggression of other nations? Far from it. We should be still more guilty, if we stood by inactive in face of evil, and refused to be called ourselves in sacrificial action as the instrument of God's judgment against evil. There are those who say that because our own national policy has been evil, therefore we may never protest or act against the policy of another nation. If that were so, God could never reign through man on earth, for we can never give to Him a wholly perfect instrument for His use. The prophets are not pacifist. They

are much too realist with the strength of evil to suppose that it can be checked without at times the use of force. It is true that they often advise submission toward another nation, when resistance is hopeless against the overwhelming strength of an invader. Yet, as we have seen, they regard the armies of the invader as the instrument of God's purpose. It is possible that our own nation may be called, like Assyria or Babylon, to be the instrument of God's judgment. The attitude of Isaiah to Assyria is that God first gave Assyria power as the instrument of His purpose; but that then Assyria abused that power, and used it for herself 'to move the bounds of peoples and rob their treasures'; and that therefore the judgment of God had finally to turn against Assyria (Is 10). It is very probable that Japan and Germany are to-day abusing their power, and seeking for their own interest to 'move the bounds of peoples.' It is therefore very probable that the call may come from God to England or to America to check that abuse. We may only hear that call in deep humility of spirit. We must recognize that God may also be using the rise to power of our enemy as a judgment on our past sins. We must beware at all costs lest we in our turn abuse our power, and so call down on ourselves the judgment of God in recurring war and counter-war. We must be ready to lay down our power, and must indeed long to do so, the moment God should call us to act in generosity and mercy. Yet just so long as God should call us to act as His servant in judgment, we must give ourselves as wholly to that call, as we hope one day to give ourselves wholly to His call to mercy.

If we can learn this lesson, then and only then there is hope for the future of our civilization in Europe. We must now notice that it is the prophets who have a deeply optimistic view of the historic process. We think to be optimistic, but in fact we are deeply and doubly pessimistic. We hope vaguely that God will bring better times. We have however no real confidence that God will restore a lasting peace to the world. In our current view of history we fail to discern God as already present and active, fulfilling His purpose amid our present warfare. We have left God an absentee from His world. If however the world is at present under the control of forces of evil and outside the control of God, then we can have no sure confidence that He will be able to regain control. Our hope is no more than a complaint that the present world is not as we like it. Meanwhile, so long as we shrink from facing the sin of the world under the judgment

of God, we are shrinking from the first step by which alone hope would come. Like the contemporaries of Jeremiah, we say, 'I have not sinned'; and it is precisely because of this unwillingness to face the judgment of God in history that this judgment still needs to be exercised against us. 'Behold I will enter into judgment with thee, because thou sayest, I have not sinned' (Jer 2³⁵). At first sight the prophets are pessimistic where we are optimistic. They speak of the doom and judgment of God, where we speak only of His kindness and pity. Yet behind their pessimism there lurks a deep and radical optimism, as behind our optimism there lies hidden a deep and radical pessimism. Just because they believe that God is already at work in judgment, therefore they can believe that He controls the course of history, and can believe with confidence that God will later manifest His mercy and restore peace and prosperity. Just because they are ready to learn the lessons that God is teaching through their present sufferings, therefore they are justified in hoping that God will redeem and deliver them, when they have first learnt these lessons.

The First Isaiah regards the Assyrian invader as the instrument of God's judgment. Just because Assyria is already regarded as the instrument of God, therefore Assyria will itself come under judgment, if it goes one step beyond its commission. If Assyria should abuse its power in aggression, then Isaiah can hear Jahweh say: 'I will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks' (Is 10¹²). With magnificent irony he sets forth the ultimate strength of the mightiest world empire in comparison with God. 'Shall the axe boast itself against him that heweth therewith? shall the saw magnify itself against him that shaketh it? as if a rod should shake them that lift it up, or as if a staff should lift up him that is not wood' (Is 10¹⁵). In due course Assyria fell, as in due course the aggression of Germany or Japan against their neighbours will be broken. Very probably our own nation will now be used to rebuke that aggression. We may only say this, if we say it in deepest penitence for our own share in causing the present attitude of Germany, and in deepest fear, lest we also go beyond our commission and abuse our power.

What Isaiah says of Assyria, the prophets of the seventh century say of Babylon. Jeremiah is very realist with the immediate present strength of Babylon. He foretells the long captivity of seventy years. 'This whole land shall be a desolation, and

an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years' (Jer 25¹¹). Deeply unpopular though the word must have been, he says at first, 'Deceive not yourselves, saying, The Chaldeans shall surely depart from us: for they shall not depart' (Jer 37⁹). In the same way, unpopular though it will be, those who plan for Christian work in China must reckon with the present strength of Japan. They must see that Japan is likely to retain a hold, at least of large areas of Northern China, for a considerable time; and it is therefore urgent to plan for the continuance of religious and educational work in the areas under Japanese occupation, and to make what concessions are necessary for such work to the actual ruling power. Then, however, we shall hope with full confidence that the God, who in His purpose allows foreign invasion, can also in His time liberate from foreign invasion. We shall say to the nations which Japan and Germany have at present conquered, what Jeremiah says in the end of Babylon: 'Be not afraid of the king of Babylon, of whom ye are afraid; be not afraid of him, saith the Lord: for I am with you to save you, and to deliver you from his hand' (Jer 42¹¹). With an amazing boldness and generosity of vision the Second Isaiah teaches the Jews in exile to regard their subjection under their oppressor as an opportunity for contact and for leading the enemy nation to the knowledge of God. Here is the highest lesson of the Exilic prophets. If a nation should for the moment be subject to another stronger nation, though in the political field there is inevitable tension and suffering, in the religious field there is opportunity. 'I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth' (Is 49⁶). Just because the Second Isaiah has this faith in the universal reign of God, therefore also he has the conviction that in the end the justice of God will triumph over the evils of aggression. With a dramatic irony, worthy of his great predecessor, the Second Isaiah puts into the mouth of Babylon the same phrase which he constantly uses to proclaim the eternity of God. Babylon may attempt to say, 'I am, and there is none else beside me' (Is 47⁸). The shadow of death is at hand, whenever any individual or nation presumes thus to claim eternity for its own rule or power. The shadow of judgment and death is at hand already over Germany and over Japan. It is equally at hand over England or America or any other nation the moment we forget our creaturely being before God. At the very moment when Babylon is

saying, 'I am, and there is none else beside me,' the Second Isaiah sees on the horizon Cyrus, the Persian king, the new instrument of God's purpose, before whom Babylon is about to fall.

'Sweet are the uses of adversity.' Whenever I read the prophets of the Babylonian exile, I think of the speech which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of another group of exiles. Just because the Jewish prophets were humble enough to recognize the hand of God in judgment through their sufferings, therefore also there was born into their hearts the jewel of a great hope. In magnificent language the hope first breaks out in Isaiah. 'For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it with judgment and with righteousness from henceforth even for ever' (Is 9⁶⁻⁷). The hope is taken up again during the Babylon invasion by Jeremiah. 'Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute judgment and justice in the land. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is his name whereby he shall be called, The Lord is our righteousness' (Jer 23⁵⁻⁶).

So long as God should call to war, we may not resist that call. As God called Assyria to be the rod of His anger, so He may call our own nation to be the instrument of His judgment. If we are true to the Biblical doctrine of God, we must recognize that He can act in judgment and in wrath, not less than in mercy. We must allow ourselves as wholly and fully to become the instrument of His judgment as we seek also and long to become the instrument of His mercy. One thing, however, we must do in time of war. We must purge our hearts of every trace of resentment, or pride, or love of power. It is these forces which have kept the world in a vicious circle of recurring war and counter-war. Each in their turn, Assyria and Babylon and later Persia abused their power, and so came under the judgment of God in a later war, in which they lost their power. In the same way the allies in 1918 abused their power, and have come under judgment in a later war. There is one path, and only one path, of escape from this vicious circle; and it is

above all things urgent that this time we see and prepare for this path.

The path is blazed by the Prince of Peace, whose coming the prophets foresaw. Its first step is forgiveness. 'I say unto you which hear, Love your enemies, do good to them that hate you, bless them that curse you, pray for them that despitefully use you' (Lk 6²⁷⁻²⁸). In Christ there came a new beginning to the world. In Christ there will come a new beginning, when the nations have learnt this lesson. The fatal step comes, when having received power from God we go beyond His commission in vindictive love of power. The critical moment will come when we are able to use our power again to dictate our own resentful will, but choose instead to lay aside our power, and to welcome an enemy that is ready for our welcome into co-operation for the building of a new world.

The first step is forgiveness. The second step is a common submission to the righteousness of God. Forgiveness implies on both sides a penitence of spirit that is willing to submit to this righteousness. Not without reason, in the Messianic vision the hope for peace is firmly linked to the thought of justice and righteousness. As more and more people in different countries are coming to see, the only hope of peace lies in the establishment of international courts of justice, whose impartiality all can trust, whose decisions can be enforced, and before whose judgment all nations will yield their sovereignty. We ought not to have been so slow to recognize the evil in national sovereignty, for if we had been true to the vision of Biblical monotheism, we should have seen long ago that the nations had no right ever to claim sovereignty for themselves. Nations, like individuals, are creaturely beings, who can only live in fellowship, when they make no claim to their own proud autonomy, but live and exist in perpetual recognition of the overruling sovereignty of God. In the East and in the West we long for peace. The verdict on our longing is stated in all simplicity by the Second Isaiah, 'There is no peace, saith the Lord, unto the wicked' (Is 48²²). If we cling to the sovereignty and autonomy of our own nation and cling to our resentments, then the only future for the world is to live under the judgment of God in recurring war and counter-war. If we learn the lesson of His judgment, and learn each for ourselves to repent, then and then alone there is hope. In this case there lies before us, constantly not yet realized but constantly at hand, constantly awaiting only our penitence for its realization, the

vision of the Messianic kingdom. If we had been faithful, we might already have entered that kingdom. 'Oh that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea' (Is 48¹⁸). If we learn at last to repent and

believe and obey, then we may still enter that kingdom. 'Then judgment shall dwell in the wilderness, and righteousness shall abide in the fruitful field. And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness and confidence for ever' (Is 32¹⁶⁻¹⁷).

Literature.

ZEUS.

Zeus, A Study in Ancient Religion, by Arthur Bernard Cook, Litt.D., volume III. Zeus, God of the Dark Sky (Earthquakes, Clouds, Wind, Dew, Rain, Meteorites). Part I: Text and Notes. Part II: Appendixes and Index (Cambridge University Press; £8, 8s. net.).

The name Zeus is not familiar to the English reader, though it actually occurs in the New Testament (Ac 14^{12,13} R.V.m.), but it is etymologically as well as otherwise intimately connected with the Latin *Iuppiter*, *Iovis* (English *Jupiter*, *Jove*), which are known to us all. The ancient rationalists argued that he was born, lived his life, and was buried in Crete. However that may be—and no one now would dispute Crete's connexion with early Greek story—he became, as every careful student of Greek literature knows, the leading god, god of the sky in all its manifestations. What is not so well known is that, just as the modern Christian notions of hell are much more indebted to Græco-Roman pagan ideas than they are to the Scriptures, so there is much in our notions of God the Father that can be traced ultimately to the Greek conceptions of Zeus.

Dr. A. B. Cook, the eminent archæologist and anthropologist, of Queens' College, Cambridge, long ago conceived a brilliant idea. He would set forth the history and character of Zeus in such fullness as a minute study of the vast resources of ancient literature, inscriptions, and art would permit. In his first and second volumes, which appeared in 1907, he discussed *Zeus, God of the Bright Sky* and *Zeus, God of the Dark Sky* respectively. They were received with rapture by the learned world and with no less gratification by the educated reader who could lay no claim to be a specialist. All were impressed not only by the multifarious and exact learning, which is obvious,

but by the attractive English style and the felicitous verse renderings of Greek poetry. In fact, very much may be learned from these volumes by the reader who is entirely unacquainted with the ancient Greek language.

The third volume deserves a welcome no less hearty than its predecessors. A feature of all three is the wonderful collection of plates (some exquisitely coloured), photographs, and drawings. In this new volume there are 83 plates and 932 figures. These furnish in themselves not only all conceivable illustrative material, but are in a sense a guide to Greek vase painting and a manual of Greek epigraphy, just as Winer's 'New Testament Grammar' was to a former Master of Trinity a grammar for the whole of Greek.

The topics discussed in these volumes are in sections of the general subject, 'Zeus as God of the Weather': they are 'Zeus and the Earthquakes,' 'Zeus and the Clouds,' 'Zeus and the Wind,' 'Zeus and the Dew,' 'Zeus and the Rain,' 'Zeus and the Meteorites' (cf. Ac 19³⁵), 'General Conclusions with regard to Zeus as god of the Dark Sky.' Appendixes deal with 'Floating Islands,' 'The Prompting Eros,' and 'The *Hierôs Gámos*' (sacred marriage). A substantial list of addenda, a few corrigenda, and two indexes (one of persons, places, and festivals, the other of subjects and authorities) conclude this superb work.

Among parts of the book which have struck me as of special interest are: 'Nephelokokkygia' (p. 44 ff.), 'tritopatores or tritopatreis' (p. 112 ff.), the "thundering" legion' (p. 324 ff.), 'the Danaides' (p. 355 ff.), 'rain of food' (p. 495 ff.), 'olive of Athena' (p. 749 ff.), 'owl of Athena' (p. 776 ff.), under 'Gorgoneion' a full discussion of the famous Bath relief (fig. 701, p. 863 ff.), 'cult of meteorites' (p. 881 ff.), 'discussion of the name *Bêthel*' (p. 891 ff.), Appendix P 'Floating Islands.'

The only practices I should venture to criticise

in these volumes are two—the somewhat curious manner in which some ancient names are spelt, and the occasional use of inferior editions of Greek and Latin literary works. The name ‘Hypermestra’ (the correct form) is given as ‘Hypermnstra’ (p. 356). It is about time that the latter, like ‘Clytemnestra,’ should disappear from printed books altogether. Authorities on Latin orthography long ago came to the conclusion that *Iuppiter* was the correct spelling. Yet in this book the name is spelt *Iupiter*, which is neither flesh nor fish. ‘Bruttium’ (p. 419) is, if I mistake not, a modern invention, as the ancients used ‘Bruttii,’ the name of the people, only, exactly as in various other cases (too little attention has been paid to this subject). ‘Firmillianus’ (p. 26) should be ‘Firmilianus.’

As regards editions of authors, Dion of Prousa (p. v) is quoted from Dindorf (!) instead of Von Arnim or de Budé. I have the authority of Dr. G. C. Richards for the statement that de Budé is an improvement on Von Arnim. The standard edition of C. U. Clark is not used for ‘Ammian’ (p. 26). The second edition of Sir D’Arcy Thompson’s *Glossary of Greek Birds* is hardly used, usually the first (pp. 45, 52, 53, etc.). Hippolytus’ *Refutatio Hæreseon* should have been cited from Wendland; Rufinus’ *Hist. Eccl.* from Mommsen; *Acts of Paul and Thekla* from a recent edition (p. 523), ‘Cæsarius, Sermon. 130. 1’ (p. 1067) is misleading. It should be ‘Pseudo-Augustine, Sermon. 130. 1,’ as very far from all the Pseudo-Augustinian sermons are by Cæsarius. Again, the standard edition of Cæsarius by Morin, which appeared in June, 1937, should have been employed, where the sermon is numbered 193. And, further, Professor Cook is wrong in preferring the reading *caniculam* to *anniculam*, which is confirmed by other passages of Cæsarius unknown to him.

These are not very serious matters (*non omnia possumus omnes*), and what follows is still less serious. On p. 339 n. 3 *et ad solum* should be *atque ad solum*. A propos of the crowd of young frogs (p. 504) I can add my own experience, late in June 1896, between Pitlochry and Dunkeld. Finally, on p. 481 n. 2 and in index, ‘Miss W. C. Wright’ should be ‘Mrs. W. C. Wright.’ A. SOUTER.

CLASSICISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

The relationship between Classicism and Christianity is illuminated by the contrast, to which Matthew Arnold gave currency among us, between the spirit of Hellenism and that of Hebraism. It is a contrast which has been carried beyond the

sphere of ethics, in which Matthew Arnold presented it, into that of theology; and recently attention has been focussed upon it anew by the Swedish theologian Nygren with his antithesis between Eros, in which Greek religion expresses itself as human aspiration, and Agape, in which the Christian religion—the culmination of Hebrew and Jewish religion—expresses itself as divine condescension.

The antithesis which Nygren has drawn so sharply is readily subject to challenge. For example, it may be granted with Nygren that the concept of *amor dei* in Augustine is a synthesis of religious ideas distinct in origin, but it may also be contended—as by John Burnaby—that neither Eros nor Agape was known to Augustine in the ‘purity’ which Nygren attributes to them: ‘neither Eros, nor Agape, nor the two together, will account for *caritas* without remainder: Augustine is not a compound of Plotinus and Luther, but a Father of the Catholic Church. In the Body of Christ, *caritas* is what it is in the mystery of the divine Being—the Holy Spirit of unity.’

The tendency to distinguish too sharply between the Hebraistic and the Hellenistic strains in Christian theology is best corrected by an intimate study of both Classicism and Christian Doctrine, such as has been recently provided within certain limits in an admirable work published by Mr. Charles Norris Cochrane under the title *Christianity and Classical Culture* (Milford; 30s. net). In this work, which is written from an objective historical standpoint and contains the fruits of a vast amount of study and research in classical and Christian literature, the author seeks to present a history of thought and action in the ancient world from Augustus to Augustine. It is a work which it would be good for the classical scholar to peruse in its latter part (the order of treatment is the inverse order of the title) and for the Christian scholar in its former part.

It would be difficult to praise this volume too highly, so well has the author accomplished what he set out to do. He has to be congratulated first of all on his effort to overcome the unfortunate dissociation between classical and Christian studies, and in particular to make a transition from the world of Augustus and Vergil to that of Theodosius and Augustine. In the effort he has had to encounter difficult issues, both philosophical and religious, and one admires the resolution with which he approaches and the ability with which he clarifies them. His book is not only a solid contribution to learning but an excellent example

of clear and pointed exposition. (Perhaps the treatment of Augustine tends in places to be discursive, and perhaps the Index may be found to be somewhat meagre.)

We must not attempt to outline the author's treatment of the revolution in thought and action which took place during the first four centuries of the Christian era, as a consequence of 'the religion of culture' being confronted with 'the culture of religion.' It must be enough to say that he distinguishes three phases of thought and action in the period before the ideals symbolized in the splendid figure of the divinized Augustus were discarded in favour of those embodied in 'the likeness of a crucified Jew.' The first was one of accommodation or adjustment to the demands of the Augustan order; the second, one of fruition; the third, one of collapse and reconstruction, involving an effort on the part of the so-called Christian emperors to renovate *Romanitas*. But he reminds us that distinctions of this kind are largely arbitrary, 'since the web of history is seamless.' The examination of Nicene Christianity, to which the rest of the book is devoted, serves to emphasize the futility of the hopes entertained by the renovationist emperors from Constantine to Theodosius: it was impossible to achieve within the forms of the New Republic the spirit of the Christian Commonwealth.

For the rest, while in many parts of this work the contrast is drawn in various contexts between Classicism and Christianity, we should like to record our appreciation of the brief comparison between the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius and the *Confessions* of Augustine, bringing out the greatness of the gulf between the mentality of the classical and that of the Christian humanist.

W. FULTON.

THE ANCHORAGE OF LIFE.

Professor Daniel Lamont, D.D., delivered an address at the International Conference of Evangelical Students in Cambridge in 1939 which he has now expanded and published under the title of *The Anchorage of Life* (Inter-Varsity Fellowship; 3s. 6d. net). It must have been a great address, condensed to the last degree, for even in its expanded form it is simply packed full of matter. It would be difficult to name any other book of similar size wherein one would find so rare a combination of excellences. Professor Lamont is a distinguished worker in the fields of science and philosophy, and he unites with

that an intensely ethical and warmly evangelical spirit.

He begins, as the Bible does, with God, going right in off the deep end as some will think. But he very speedily justifies his method. Where else are we to begin? We must make a beginning somewhere. 'The notion that we can make a complete regress from effect to cause, and then to a remoter cause, and so on till we reach a First Cause, is a fantasy of the mind.' We must make a start with something which cannot be proved but is received by faith. Science cannot help us here, for 'science deals with relations between things within the Universe, but there is only one Universe and there is no other to which it is related.' If we make *things* our starting point in our endeavour to explain the Universe we shall speedily find the futility of that. If we make *persons* the starting point we are on a more hopeful road, for we find in experience that 'will is the only real cause in the Universe,' and we are led in the direction of a Supreme Will as the Author of all things.

From these high themes Professor Lamont goes on to speak of the Word of God, God as Redeemer, the Church, Eternal Life, the Fact of Evil, and similar topics, concluding with Christ the Universal Key. A few quotations may give some idea of the variety of subjects touched upon and of the clearness and incisiveness of the writing. 'Can any one seriously imagine that God would have sent His Son to suffer and die for us *in this world*, if we were all to have another chance *in the next world*?' 'It comes to this that God has no opportunity with us until we are thoroughly dissatisfied with ourselves. When self-will becomes endemic, as it has done in our age, He sends trouble upon the earth to arouse at least some from deadly sleep. . . . For tragedy there *is* in life and if they will not reckon with it, it will reckon with them.' 'If the state of the world in this twentieth century does not convince us that man's wisdom is mainly folly, nothing will convince us. The nations have still an opportunity to take God's way and give His Son His rightful place upon the world's throne.' It is an inspiration to see such a weight of learning consecrated with firmness of conviction to exalt Christ as the Alpha and the Omega of this mysterious Universe.

J. H. MORRISON.

IMAGE WORSHIP.

Room could not be found in his larger book on 'Symbolism and Belief' for four lectures on the particular instance of symbolism which is to be

found in the use of carved and painted images, and Dr. Edwyn Bevan now publishes them in separate form under the title *Holy Images* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). He has amassed an immense amount of information on the subject, and he gives us the essence of it, both from a historical and a critical point of view, in an exceedingly interesting, clear and convincing study. He cites many illustrations of extravagant attitude on this topic, but he does not allow these to divert his attention from the main subject, which is the actual practice and usefulness of image worship.

Three positions are possible in this matter—that of fanatical iconoclasm, that of almost superstitious belief in the immediate efficacy of image worship, and, finally, a disposition to allow its usefulness as educative symbolism, especially in view of the inability of the mass of the people to understand truth put merely in the form of doctrine. Dr. Bevan inclines towards the last-mentioned position. He traces the variety of attitudes in Jewish religion, in Greece, and in Christianity up to the Reformation with numerous side-references to Hinduism, Buddhism, and even to the practical difficulties of Christian converts in Japan at the present day. While he rightly disclaims sympathy with the superior person who criticizes the perfervid missionary because of the latter's alleged mistaken notion that idol worshippers bow down to sticks and stones, and points out that no one would venture to pass such a crude judgment in societies in which the doctrine of Divine Immanence and also the idea of the ingression of the god into the image are prevalent, he shows that the superior person is more superficial than really superior. The crucial question is whether the religious symbol is supposed to have efficacy directly, or only by means of its effect in stimulating the consciousness of the worshipper. The first alternative means superstition; only in the second does the real value of symbols appear—in their vivifying effect upon religious worship, and in the community which they establish between the present and the past by means of their commemorative function, especially when the veneration of images is connected with the invocation of saints. Dr. Bevan thinks that Protestantism has erred in making too little use of commemoration, but on the other hand he thinks that the advantages of symbolism may be purchased at too great a price. He shows that superstition lies close at hand when a secondary reverence for the image itself is substituted for that deeper reverence for the Reality beyond, which alone is truly religious. He also discusses

most interestingly the question whether pictorial representation of God and of Christ may not result in the introduction of a fourth Person in the Trinity, namely an imaginary being altogether different from reality. The related question whether adoration of an imaginary portrait is not better than no worship at all, suggests a useful reference to the idea, ultimately Platonic but shared by Neo-Platonists and Moslems alike, that image worship is untrue and therefore to be condemned because it is at a farther remove from reality. Dr. Bevan's general conclusion seems to be that images are of most value when we use them not as specific aids to religion but for the encouragement of the appropriate æsthetic and artistic mood.

One could not wish a more illuminating book on a subject which is of immense importance for those who have to deal not only with conflicts between 'high' and 'low' within the Church but also with contacts between Christianity and non-Christian religions.

W. S. URQUHART.

A GREAT MEDICAL MISSION.

A minister of the Church of Scotland recently advised his people to read accounts of the work of Foreign Missions if they wished to find an antidote to the stories of carnage that we read daily in our newspapers. *Knife and Life in India*, by Dr. T. Howard Somervell (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net), provides just what is needed to deliver us from the debasement that such things produce in us and to restore our moral health. The one thing that is unfortunate in this book is its title. It gives an account of what is being done to-day in the extreme south of India by a Medical Mission which has grown to its present greatness through a hundred years. The story is told with passion and conviction by the remarkable man who has been its chief 'surgical missionary' for the past sixteen years.

Dr. Howard Somervell proved himself on Everest. He has proved himself still more surely by his years at Neyyoor. He tells his tale with a forcefulness and a candour that refresh one on every page and reveal the personality behind the record. One may not always be able to agree fully with his opinions, but with the man himself, the Christian man who holds them, one can deeply agree. One must desire that he may be able long to continue to shape with his dedicated operating knife that India of which he says that 'it is quite likely that within a comparatively short time it will be in the position of real world-leadership.'

The medical missionary sees into the darkest places of a nation's life. Dr. Somervell uses no smooth words to describe the cruelties that ignorance and evil custom perpetrate in India. Some of the stories he tells the lay reader may find it difficult to read through. (He mentions that when he was frank in an address in England two of his audience had to retire sick.) But no one can deny that he proves his case for the medical missionary, not merely as the deliverer from such horrors but also more positively as the messenger of a love to which his life bears witness. 'There will always be a call for Christian hospitals. There is, or ought to be, an atmosphere about a mission hospital that you will not get in any Government hospital.' 'How can we introduce hungering humanity to the love of God better than by loving them in His name.'

To the difference that Christ makes in the lives of those whom this message wins to Him Dr. Somervell bears emphatic testimony. He bears testimony to the quality of his own Indian Christian fellow-workers, going so far as to say that if a comparison is made on the basis of standards of 'efficiency, reliability, friendliness, and Christian life,' 'the Britisher might excel in reliability and occasionally in his efficiency, but some at least of our doctors and nurses would come out not merely above the average but right at the top in all four.'

Those whom Dr. Somervell thus describes are the descendants of outcasts converted by the labours of Ringeltaube. From these people of whom that good man said that they were 'great rogues' there has come, as Dr. Sidney Cave bears witness, 'a great Christian Church in which the notes of the Holy Spirit are to-day unmistakable.' That brings us to the one matter in regard to which Dr. Somervell's judgment seems to go astray. He protests strongly—but not too strongly—against the importation of foreign denominationalism into India. He wants a better Church than any that has yet been produced, and he is right to want this. But in his iconoclasm he seems to forget that the best of churches is made up of sinful men and women and that the Christ who became man for us knows that this is so. Therefore in spite of its grievous faults the Church through the centuries has borne and still bears its witness, and neither India nor any other land can afford to cut loose from that evidence of God's patience with His children. As Dr. Somervell himself demonstrates the notes of the Holy Spirit are unmistakable in the Church of South Travancore and it inherits and carries forward to the future the

long tradition of the Holy Catholic Church. A splendid part of that tradition is the service of love rendered by such a great Medical Mission as that of Neyyoor whose story Dr. Somervell tells with such vividness and vigour.

NICOL MACNICOL.

YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY.

Religion Yesterday and To-day, by Henry Sloane Coffin, Brown Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, and President of the Faculty, Union Theological Seminary, New York (Cokesbury Press, Nashville; \$1.75). Dr. Coffin has reached an age when it is natural to look back and survey the years through which he has lived and laboured and observed. Dr. Moffatt did the same in 'The Day before Yesterday,' the most attractive of his books, and a comparison between the two is not altogether favourable to Dr. Coffin. His work is a little heavy-handed and lacks the brightness and rich allusiveness of his colleague's. It suffers also from the fact that the day before yesterday ('the period immediately preceding the generation in which most of us were born') presents a much more definite contrast to to-day than yesterday does. Yesterday (the 'nineties and after) had a good deal of to-day in it. The forces at work to-day were already apparent in the immediate past, and the view in Dr. Coffin's picture is therefore sometimes a little vague in its outlines. What we have, however, is thoroughly interesting and informative. Dr. Coffin selects six subjects and describes the changes he has witnessed in their interpretation in the course of a generation. The subjects are: Evolutionary Science, The Divine Immanence, Biblical Criticism, Religious Experience, The Social Conscience, and The Church. They are well chosen for the purposes of such a review as we have here. And Dr. Coffin has drawn upon his wide reading and accurate scholarship to illustrate the developments, if that is the word, which he describes.

His judgments are not always convincing. He is critical of the idea of Divine Immanence, and draws a distinction between omnipresence and immanence. If God is present in the beauty of the world, in the green of the tree, in the flight of a bird, in the soul of man, that is surely immanence. No doubt the reaction against the exaggerated idea of transcendence went too far in a practical pantheism which unduly exalted the idea of man, reduced the uniqueness of Christ, and largely fostered humanism. But the solid truth of immanence remains. And to many of us who were brought

up to believe that God was 'up there,' and that He used to do wonderful things in Bible times but not now, the thought of God as the indwelling power of all good has been an infinite comfort.

Again, Dr. Coffin, like many other writers to-day, discredits the idea of inevitable progress. He speaks of 'the shattering of the faith in automatic progress.' I cannot imagine what automatic progress is. There can be no progress without mind behind it. And it seems to me perfectly clear that if God is in His world, and working there, there *must* be progress. It is not to the point to show us the terrible evils of the present age, Nazism and the widespread denial of decent standards. No intelligent doctrine of evolution denies throw-backs and no intelligent doctrine of progress denies retrogressions. But, if God is the immanent living God of the Bible and the gospel, things must be getting steadily better.

The real question raised by such a book as this is: Is to-day better on the whole than yesterday? In some ways, certainly. The religious atmosphere is warmer. In my youth evolutionary science was aggressively hostile to religious faith. To-day it is not. Philosophy was at the best negative. To-day it is distinctly more spiritual. It is easier for a young man to believe in God than it was yesterday, and still easier than the day before yesterday. Atheistic secularism was a fierce and open foe of religion then. It had its crowded meetings, its widespread literature, its cartoons, openly sold, burlesquing the gospel facts. All that has passed away. It may be reasonably claimed also that the menace of unbelieving criticism of the Bible, and especially of the gospel story, has substantially disappeared. I hope it is not undue optimism to say that in a large estimate the religious situation to-day is better than it was, say, fifty years ago.

On one point there may be disagreement. Authority does not command the assent it did yesterday. Neither Church nor Bible commands it. When evangelists, like Mr. Moody, could quote a verse of the Bible yesterday, and say, 'Thus saith the Lord,' *and be believed*, they had a mighty instrument for conversion. When the Church was so powerful that you had to belong to it or be deprived of any decent appointment, that made the nation look religious. Is the disappearance of this authority a good thing or a bad? It is a good thing if people are enlightened as to what and where true authority lies. And I am more and more convinced that the ministers of the churches ought to enlighten their people on this particular matter. There is too great a gulf between pulpit and pew. The

average layman suspects that something has happened to weaken the basis of faith, but he does not know what it is. And this vague uneasiness is one of the most serious obstacles to anything like a revival of spiritual life in the churches. There never was a time, perhaps, when it was more necessary for the Church to exercise its teaching function than to-day. Truth will be served, and it is served best by being proclaimed.

F. J. RAE.

SEX PROBLEMS.

The Rev. W. E. Sargent, M.A., B.D., has put into *The Psychology of Marriage and the Family Life* (Independent Press; 3s. 6d. net) a great deal of practical wisdom. He discards technical language and has written a book which all can understand, and in which nearly all men and women may find much useful guidance. Further, Mr. Sargent has actually made up his mind about many important questions, so that the reader will not be annoyed by vague generalities which offer no real guidance.

In his chapter on 'Marital Adjustments' he is equally emphatic about the necessity of attaining sexual adjustment and about the fact that a successful marriage cannot be built upon the sexual factor alone. It would be well if all books on the matter would insist equally on both these points.

When he comes to discuss 'Triangular Situations' he has wise things to say about the necessity of facing the facts frankly and of trying honestly to find a solution for them. But he also faces quite frankly the fact that there are cases in which the only alternatives for a husband and a wife seem to be living in constant enmity or divorce. And in such cases Mr. Sargent recommends divorce.

It is well that this is followed by a discussion of the reasons why many marriages threaten to break down, and a good deal is said about the ways in which these calamities might be averted.

In discussing 'Childless Marriages,' after some sympathetic words for those who fain would have children but cannot, there follows a clear and convincing exposure of the tragic mistake made by those who for selfish reasons refuse parentage. And it is suggested that those who cannot have children of their own would do well to consider the plan of adopting children, which has worked so very well in many cases.

On this there follows a chapter on 'The Only Child,' and the very serious handicaps to which the only child is exposed are clearly indicated. There is also at this point a very good passage

about 'Possessive Love'—that disastrous form of selfishness. But it might have been well if it had been pointed out that it is not merely only children who are often wronged by being loved in a possessive way.

It is into this chapter that there is inserted a wise and outspoken treatment of the subject of birth control. The following is worth quoting. 'Sexual intercourse constitutes a bond of intimate affection between husband and wife; it is an expression of their love for one another; sometimes it is the means of removing every touch of estrangement, and without it many partners would grow strangers to each other.'

Into the chapter on 'Family Life' as much practical wisdom is packed as could be contained in a short chapter. Mr. Sargent is all against corporal punishment, which he insists is always a confession of defeat. And he is equally emphatic about the fact that quarrels between parents, of which children become aware, have very serious consequences for those children.

The subjects of 'Growing Old Together' and of 'Religion in the Family Life' are well and finely dealt with, and then in conclusion there is a chapter, full of sensitive sympathy, addressed to the unmarried and the widowed. Mr. Sargent is at least fully aware of the intense and painful problems which such women have to face, and of which society as a whole hardly seems to be conscious. There are clear and true words in this chapter about the solution of such problems afforded by sublimation, but perhaps the difficulty of such sublimation, which in some cases is acute, is hardly fully recognized.

This is a fine, sane, and most useful book.

Mr. G. L. Russell, M.B., Ch.B., who is also an ordained clergyman, has written this short book—*Sex Problems in War-Time* (S.C.M.; 1s. net)—about the 'tremendous sexual strains which war conditions impose' on many men and women. And it is essentially a book for war-time.

Naturally he has felt compelled to deal at length with the subject of 'Sex Relations without Marriage.' Two sentences from this section are worth quoting. 'There is something exceedingly dangerous to persons and to society as a whole, in claiming the prerogatives of a state and refusing its responsibilities.' 'If we begin to demand the "rights" of married people, but without marriage, marriage itself will disappear . . . it would be better to lose the war than to lose marriage and family life.'

Dr. Russell has also to face the vexed question of 'Prophylaxis against Venereal Disease.' And

after a wise review of the whole matter concludes that the really effective way of combating venereal disease is to provide the soldier with such outlets, relaxations, and interests as will prevent him from seeking his relaxation in disastrous forms.

The book concludes with short chapters on 'Homosexuality' and 'Continence and Health,' and what is said is wisely said, and with much charity. A good book for the times.

A. HERBERT GRAY.

We had pleasure some two years ago in reviewing the first volume of a useful compendium of materials for the historical study of Christian Sociology. The editors are Canon Cyril E. Hudson, M.A., and Mr. Maurice B. Reckitt, M.A. The general title of the work is *The Church and the World* (Allen & Unwin. The second volume (7s. 6d. net), which is now before us, deals with *The Foundations of the Modern World* and is contributed by Canon Hudson. It treats of the period from the fourteenth to the eighteenth century. (The third volume, which is to appear shortly from Mr. Reckitt's pen, will concentrate upon the religious and social situation in England from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the present day.) In this volume guidance is offered, through quotations from leading authorities and with the aid of a running commentary, upon such subjects as the Conciliar Movement, the Political Philosophy of Secularism, and the Disintegration of the Mediæval Economic Synthesis. At the same time Canon Hudson has his eye upon the sociological issues of the present world situation. For example, he speaks of the Mediæval Church as 'Totalitarian' in its methods no less than its claims, remarking that the Gestapo and the Ogpu have little to learn from the Inquisition. Or again, in discussing the influence of Machiavelli, he notes that both Mussolini and Hitler have proclaimed their admiration for the teaching of 'The Prince,' and that its specific teaching about the use of the lie finds its echo in Nazi views on propaganda.

The author of *Understanding the Parables of Our Lord* (Cokesbury Press; \$2.00), Professor A. E. Barnett, is obviously impressed with Canon Streeter's view that Matthew and Luke were indebted to Mark for the narrative framework that they used. They had in addition to Mark a second source on which they both drew, and which was primarily composed of teaching materials. The teaching

source is called Q, and is regarded as having originated in Antioch about A.D. 50. This commentary bears the mark of painstaking care. The writer has read the apposite literature; and if much that he says is not new, he is manifestly in sympathy with the spiritual and ethical teaching that he unfolds. He stresses the admiration of Montefiore of the inwardness of much of our Lord's points of view. He holds that the Roman world of Christ's day was aristocratic. The leaders who popularized Christianity saw, however, that the future lay with the dispossessed and downtrodden multitude. It was to them, therefore, that they made their primary appeal. Obscurity in the eyes of the world may be the pathway to the fullest accomplishment. Jesus won many followers. His 'following' gradually dwindled, and by the evangelists' time had all but disappeared. Not inappropriate to the discouraged in the twentieth century is the peculiarly *inward* aspect of the message. If Jesus could not have it externally, He claimed it internally. His thought of religion took its rise from a profound self-knowledge that made a man see his dependence upon God. He evaluated men on the basis of potentiality rather than of status. Men judge by appearances, and their appraisals are qualified by a confused sense of values. God, by contrast, sees beyond the surface to the centre of things, and is moved exclusively by moral fact. The forty and more parables which Professor Barnett analyses will have a freshness of meaning when read in the light of such a background. Readers of this journal will admit that in exposition we all require to make these old tales stand out, as the hills around Jerusalem do, with the impress not only of something easily discerned, but as the symbols of Eternal truth which none has fully fathomed.

Two 'Pilot Books' are published by the Epworth Press, in what is apparently a series, at fourpence each. They all deal with 'the Christian and World Affairs,' and the publications referred to are numbers three and four. Number three answers the question, *Why Do Nations Fight?* The answer is given by the Rev. W. F. Lofthouse, D.D. He says nations fight because of three causes—impatience, fear, and greed. These may all be reduced to the third cause, greed. The question of right and wrong is not discussed here, but the analysis of motives for war is made with keen insight and honesty.

The other booklet is on *The Christian and the Jewish Problem* and is written by Mr. William W.

Simpson, M.A., General Secretary of the Christian Council for Refugees from Germany and Central Europe. Those who have made themselves acquainted with some of the numerous books on this subject which have been issued in recent years will naturally find the treatment here slight. But the book is not meant for them. It is meant for those who know little or nothing of the problem, and, judged by this standard, it gives a fair account of the matter. It discusses, first, the Jewish Problem, secondly, the Causes of the Problem, and finally, some Practical Implications. The discussion will serve as an introduction to the questions that this grave problem raises.

There is need in these days, if in any, of some well-founded spiritual resource. Central in the real incentive is the Evangel of Christ. So the Rev. W. H. Elliott insists in *Christianity at Bay* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). Is there always present in these moral essays a full statement of the gospel implied? There is at all events a deeply concerned and inspiring spiritual teacher. At his call many on the wireless, as they have listened, took up their cross with new courage on their pilgrim way. He believes in what is called 'affirmation.' In hours of darkness and depression we should state to ourselves what we believe about God. In prayer there is far too much speaking. Out of the great silences come forth the spiritually great. 'Experience,' says Aldous Huxley, 'is not what happens to a man. It is what a man does with what happens to him.' There is a law in the universe that works against any human being who tries to keep things to himself. He can only have these things by giving them away. Samuel Johnson counted that day lost in which he did not meet at least one new acquaintance. That is why the Dead Sea is so bitter. There is a constant inflow but no outflow at all. It is in a variety of short counsels that Mr. Elliott attempts to stir the conscience, to allay fear, and to bring about in our nation a deeper sense of the Presence Divine. He has enticing titles. Does he give us as much as we really require? Diverting and true as are many of his sayings, there is a real lack of doctrinal basis, and of deep reflectiveness to solve the problems of the day.

An admirable little book of counsel to Army Chaplains has been written by the Dean of Bristol, the Rev. Harry W. Blackburne, D.S.O., M.C., *Clergy in War-time* (Hodder & Stoughton; 1s. net). It is introduced by the Archbishop of Canterbury,

and has a postscript by the Bishop of Bristol. There are four chapters by the Dean on, respectively, Clergy and Civil Defence, Clergy and Air Raids, A Chaplain with Officers and Men, and A Chaplain on the Field of Battle. There is very little theory here, for the book is written by a man who has a distinguished record for bravery and good sense in the last war. It is full of wise advice of the most practical nature, and should really be in the hands of every chaplain. Its directions will save them from many mistakes, and they will certainly be grateful for guidance which deals with real situations.

Prayers of Citizenship, by Mr. Kenneth T. Henderson, M.A., B.Litt. (Longmans ; 3s. 6d. net), is a book of prayers which can be warmly commended. It will be serviceable alike to those desirous of cultivating their own spiritual life and to those charged with leading public devotions in these critical days. Well conceived, the book is divided into sections—War, Work, Friends, etc.—each section being headed by a preface in which, as in the main preface, the author says some wise things in regard to prayer, particularly in reference to the subjects dealt with, which warrant and will repay consideration. The prayers are well expressed and are uniformly helpful.

The History of the Reformation was originally published in 1907 by the late Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge, the Rev. J. P. Whitney, D.D. The preparation of the new edition (S.P.C.K. ; 12s. 6d. net) is largely due to Dr. Whitney himself, but Miss M. T. Stead has brought the work to completion and takes responsibility for the form at least of one or two of the chapters, which, it may be said, are amongst the best in the book. His biographer says of Dr. Whitney that 'everything he wrote is packed with learning,' and the truth of the generalization is apparent in the book before us. The period covered is the whole of the sixteenth century and the first half of the seventeenth. The author believes more in a concrete narrative of events than in any approach to a philosophy of history, but he does indicate certain fundamental tendencies of the period, notably the growing importance of the individual, the rise of nationalism, and the increasing prosperity of the commercial towns. He seems on the whole to be more interested in the opposition to the Reformation than in the Reformation itself, and emphasizes strongly the

view that both Reformation and Counter-Reformation sprang from the same causes, the former being moulded even more than the latter by political considerations. He is slightly patronizing in his estimate of Luther, but more sympathetic towards him than towards Zwingli and Calvin. The general impression left by the book is that the divisions in the Church caused by the Reformation might have been avoided if it had not been for the mis-handling of the situation by the leaders on both sides of the controversy. He deprecates the popular and superficial Protestant conception that the Popes of the period merited opposition simply because they were popes, and argues that their attitude was perfectly intelligible, that they were by no means faithless men, and failed, not because of what they did, but because of what they did not do—in that they did not rise to the height of their opportunities for reform for which the age was urgently calling. A disproportionate amount of space seems to be devoted to the Council of Trent, and the chapters upon religious developments in England and in Scotland are so good—although not altogether free from bias—that we wish a fuller treatment had been given to affairs in these countries.

Spiritual Issues of the War, by the Rev. W. Thompson Elliott, M.A., Canon of Westminster (S.C.M. ; 9d. net), discusses matters of vital interest to all Christians, and discusses them in a fair and helpful manner. There are five chapters, in which the writer deals with such matters as, what the essential issue at stake in this war is, the practice of prayer in war-time, and the Church in time of war. The gist of the matter is put clearly in the following words: 'I can see no inconsistency between believing in the indestructibility of eternal values and striving to the utmost to avoid the overthrow of the civilization in which these principles are at present finding at least some measure of expression any more than I can see inconsistency between trying to avoid being run over in a black-out and having a strong belief in the skill of surgeons to repair a broken limb.' One of the best chapters is that on the function of the Church in time of war. It is full of practical sense, and suggests lines of useful service instead of dealing in vague generalities.

The book lends itself to discussion, and the questions and suggestions provided after each chapter would be useful for groups of people who meet to find the way of truth on these great matters.

Constructive Theology.

XI. Justification.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP S. WATSON, M.A., GLASGOW.

IN its doctrine of justification the Christian faith possesses a succinct and striking means of expressing its own distinctive character. This is not the only, nor the only legitimate, means which it possesses, but it may reasonably be claimed as the most suggestive and challenging. Yet the doctrine of justification, at least under that name, can scarcely be said to hold a prominent place in modern Christian discussion and propaganda. The very word 'justification' has, for many people, a rather antique and even a repellent sound. Associated pre-eminently with two, or perhaps three, great names in Christian history, it seems to belong, with them, to the past. But it is surely not without significance that these names have become symbols of epoch-making moments in Christendom, moments when the gospel, threatened with eclipse or largely obscured, suddenly shone forth again in full vigour and undimmed.

The Apostle Paul, Martin Luther, and John Wesley, despite all distance of time and dissimilarity of circumstance between them, have one thing in common. Each of them wrestled with the same personal problem; each found the same answer; and each proclaimed his discovery, with startling and well-known results. Their problem was the fundamental religious question, how they were to adjust their relationship to God; their answer was the specifically Christian solution, formulated in terms of the doctrine of justification. Whatever else may have influenced the men and their work, this problem and its solution undoubtedly furnished the dominant impulse of their lives. Their one supreme aim was to present the gospel to their world, in all its fullness and unalloyed.

It is not, however, the intention of this article to discuss the historical emergence and development of the doctrine of justification, nor to enter into the controversies which have been raised around the outstanding figures we have named. Its intention is rather to show how the Christian doctrine of justification provides an effective, if summary, formulation of the very essence of the gospel; how it answers, in a way that cannot be surpassed, the fundamental question of all religion;

and how it adequately meets the deepest needs of human life.

The word 'justification' itself is a term of legal origin, which owes its theological usage to the legalistic conception of religion typical of Judaism. God is the righteous Judge, who will one day judge every man in strict accordance with His law. The Law is the expression of God's holy and righteous will, and in the Judgment only those who have conformed to its requirements will be 'justified,' or pronounced righteous. No one who has transgressed the Law of God has any hope of 'justification,' unless he repents; that is, unless he ceases from disobedience and learns to obey; for God 'will not justify the wicked' (Ex 23⁷). According to the verdict finally pronounced, reward or punishment will be meted out. The righteous will 'enter the kingdom of heaven' and 'inherit eternal life'; the wicked and sinners will be excluded from the Kingdom and forfeit the life.

From this Jewish view the Christian differs profoundly, though its terminology is largely the same. God is still a righteous Judge, and the awe of His judgment remains. It is still only the justified who gain the life of His kingdom. The Law is still an expression of God's will, and as such is 'holy and just and good.' Indeed, the deepest intention of the Law is first truly seen when it is interpreted and fulfilled by Christ, who sums up God's will for us in the words: 'Ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.' This, however, is to demand the impossible. Even the most scrupulous observance of the Law does not attain this; and in the light of Christ it is only too plain that 'all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God.' (Or would any one seriously claim: 'I am as good as Christ, as good as God'? Yet God wills nothing less.) Who, then, can possibly be 'justified'? It is at this point that the astonishing and revolutionary thing happens. God, who in the Old Testament abominates the unjust judge (cf. Pr 17¹⁵), actually 'justifies the ungodly'; He opens the kingdom of heaven and grants eternal life to sinners. And He does this on the ground of His pure mercy and grace alone, out of His freely given and unmerited love. The sole condition

required on man's part is faith—what is offered must be accepted, the gift must be received, the grace appropriated.

The term 'justification' has often been criticised as too redolent of the law-court for Christian use, where it is said to introduce an improper and even a dangerous note into theology. There is an element of truth in this criticism, especially if we consider only the etymology of the word. Etymology, however, is rarely a safe guide to doctrine; for the real meaning of any word is only to be found in its context. From the context we have briefly outlined it should be clear that even in Judaism 'justification' is not something purely forensic. It is never a mere verdict of acquittal and nothing more; but it is an acquittal which carries with it admission to God's kingdom and a share in His eternal life. (A similar caveat should, incidentally, be entered regarding other terms which may be used to express the same idea as justification. The remission or forgiveness of sins, for instance, never means the *mere* cancellation of a debt.) When, however, Christianity speaks of 'justification by faith' or 'by grace,' or 'the justification of the sinner,' it becomes quite evident that if we are in a law-court, a very remarkable change has taken place in the atmosphere. In fact, the language of the law-court has been used, with deliberate intent, to destroy the very idea of legalism in religion. Free forgiveness is neither the rule nor the exception in a court of law; still less a forgiveness of this kind, which means not merely that the case is dismissed, but that the guilty sinner is received into fellowship with the holy God.

If, in the broad outline we have drawn, we have rightly interpreted the Christian meaning of justification, it is not difficult to see that it does effectively formulate the essential import of the gospel. Thus far we have considered it simply in idea; we may now turn to the reality which underlies this idea. On what grounds does Christianity base its paradoxical view? If Judaism expects the justification of the righteous at some Great Assize, where and how is the justification of sinners realized according to Christianity? The answer to these questions lies in the content of the Christian message; that is, in Jesus Christ. In the Incarnation and Cross of Christ, and in His Church with its Word and Sacraments, the idea of justification finds its concrete reality; these are the facts on which the theory is based.

When the Christian faith affirms that in Jesus Christ the eternal and living God is present among men, this can only mean that God does in fact

receive sinners into fellowship with Himself. The teaching of Jesus itself is sufficient to dismiss all thought of human merit or desert as a factor determining God's dealings with men. God makes His sun shine and His rain fall on the just and the unjust, and is kind to the unthankful and the evil. The wages of the Labourers in the Vineyard bear no relation whatever to the hours they have worked. The Publican, who appears before God as a sinner with nothing to plead, goes home 'justified,' rather than the scrupulously dutiful Pharisee who claims his reward. Such a claim is absurd, for even when men have done all that is commanded, they can say no more than: 'we have only done our duty.' What is already clear in the teaching of Jesus becomes even more plain from His conception and fulfilment of His own mission. 'I came,' He says, 'not to call the righteous, but sinners': and He became notorious as one who 'receiveth sinners and eateth with them.' He came 'to seek and to save that which was lost'; and He created a scandal by becoming a 'friend of publicans and sinners.' There were even occasions when He anticipated the prerogative of God, and pronounced to sinners the absolution and remission of their sins.

Here, however, a problem arises which might well have been raised above, and which certainly occurred to those who observed the behaviour of Jesus or heard the preaching of Paul. If Jesus deliberately cultivates the friendship of publicans and sinners, must He not be a sinner Himself? If God 'justifies the ungodly,' how can He remain righteous Himself? The answer is that He can and He does—at the cost of the Cross. This answer is indicated, though not elaborated, in Ro 3²⁵⁻²⁶, where the Cross ('as a propitiation . . . by his blood') is seen as an act of God 'to shew his righteousness . . . that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus.' Now it is beyond our province here to discuss all that is involved in the 'propitiation,' or to examine the many and varied theories of Atonement. What is of importance is that when the holy God enters into fellowship with sinful men, it can only be done at this great price. As a matter of historical fact, there were only two possible ways by which Jesus could have avoided the Cross; He could have acquiesced in human sin, or He could have left men to their fate. He could have accepted the standards of value and understanding of life maintained by the men whose fellowship He sought; or else He could have withdrawn Himself from their society. But in neither

case would He have fulfilled His mission ; and He refused to do either, though the refusal led Him to the Cross. He offered men His fellowship, but on His terms and not theirs ; and the friendship of the Son of God for sinners quite literally cost Him His life. Small wonder, then, that the Cross becomes the supreme sign and seal of divine grace and love, since 'while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.'

Were it not for the Incarnation and the Cross the idea of justification would be a mere theory, had it ever existed at all. But were it not for the Church with its Word and Sacraments, Incarnation and Cross would scarcely be more than an ancient tale. It is through the fellowship of the Church, the Body of Christ, animated by His Spirit, that justification becomes a present reality for all who believe. The Church is the medium through which He still continues His characteristic work of love. When the Word of the gospel is preached, it is Christ Himself who, through halting human words, still comes 'to call sinners.' When the Bread is broken and the Wine poured out, it is Christ Himself who still 'receiveth sinners,' with whom He shares His very life. Whenever the 'two or three' are really met in His name, He is there present with His own. It is here that 'justification' is realized ; for it is here that He leads sinners into real and actual communion with the living God.

The essential meaning of Incarnation, Cross, and Church is crystallized in the doctrine of justification ; and this meaning is the ground for saying that that doctrine answers, in a way not to be surpassed, the fundamental question of all religion.

All real religion is, or claims to mediate, communion with the eternal, fellowship with God. The question of questions for any religion is, therefore, how this fellowship and communion are brought about. The difference between the various religions is nowhere more apparent than in the different answers they give to this question. Broadly speaking, however, there are only two main types into which they can be divided. Either the realization of fellowship with God depends primarily on something that man does or is ; or else it depends primarily upon what God is and does. In Judaism we have seen an example of the former type. Man finds favour and acceptance with God if he fulfils the Law ; he is righteous, and can rightly claim God's fellowship ; that is the due reward of his merit. In Christianity we find precisely the opposite. Man finds favour and acceptance with God because

God wills to show favour to him ; he is a sinner, who has no claim to God's fellowship ; this is the free gift of God's grace and unmerited love. Beyond the point which Christianity thus reaches it is impossible to go ; for here the realization of man's fellowship with God is conditioned solely, and not just primarily, by God.

Now it is true that even in Christianity there is a condition to be fulfilled by man if he is really to enter into fellowship with God ; he must have faith. Although 'all have sinned' and 'Christ died for all,' so that God's grace and love are equally free for all, nevertheless not all men live in the fellowship of that love, not all accept it, not all have faith. Does not this suggest that, after all, it depends largely upon man ? Or are we to say that faith itself is the gift of God, and risk becoming entangled in the dark and mysterious problems of predestination ? With those problems we certainly cannot deal here ; but two observations may well be made. First, if faith is a 'condition' of fellowship with God, it is one quite unlike that constituted by the 'works' of legalistic religion. These meritorious deeds profess to form the legitimate basis of a claim to God's favour ; but faith is not the basis of any claim. It is rather the actual claiming and appropriating of the favour freely offered. In Judaism the favour is absent if the works are lacking ; in the gospel the favour is there whether faith is present or not. To say that justification is 'by faith alone' is to express from the human standpoint what from the divine standpoint is 'by grace alone' ; both phrases sound the death-knell of all legalism and merit. Secondly, when faith is asserted to be a gift of God, this is in order to prevent its ever being regarded as another kind of 'work.' And there is good reason why such an assertion should not be lightly disregarded, for there is at least an element of profound truth in it. The faith in question would have been a literal impossibility but for the divine grace of the Incarnation and the Cross and the unceasing initiative of the divine love through the Church.

The reality of this divine love, which condescends from the unclouded summits of eternity to sojourn in the gloomy valleys of time, is what vindicates the claim of Christianity to be the final and absolute religion. This is not to say that there are no traces of the divine initiative in other religions ; but in no other religion is it so central, so sovereign, so complete. Now whenever God becomes a factor of serious moment in a man's life, and the question of fellowship with Him grows urgent, it is the

most natural thing to assume that it is necessary for man to become in some way like God in order to have communion with Him. He must be worthy of God, and attain to God's level; whether by his own efforts or with divine aid, he must scale the heights in his quest for God. Christianity, however, puts an end to all this; for it both effects what all religions seek to do, and at the same time rejects their method. So far from being yet another form of man's age-long quest for God, it proclaims God's own quest for man; and it offers a real and certain communion with God, not on the high level of God's holiness, but on the low level of man's sinfulness. There can be no certainty or assurance of attainment, where all depends on what man achieves; but here the emphasis is placed, not upon man, but God and His eternal grace. And it is upon God the emphasis ought to be laid in any religion worthy of the name. If God is really to be God, He must be sovereign and supreme; and He is never more truly God than in the exercise of His justifying grace.

When Christianity offers fellowship with God on the level of sin, it undoubtedly meets the deepest religious needs of man; but it might well appear to do so at the expense of destroying the foundations of his ethical life. If God receives the sinner so freely, is there not every reason for making the antinomian assumption that ethical considerations are irrelevant? If heaven is not gained, nor hell avoided, by seeking to do the good and right, why should we trouble to do it? The only answer to such a question is that if the good is sought as a means to some end beyond itself, we are not really doing the ethically good. We are not really seeking God's will, but our own; for our eye is on the end *we* wish to attain; legalism is bad ethics as well as bad religion. From this difficulty, however, the doctrine of justification liberates us. The justified man is delivered from any concern about rewards and punishments, and God's will can be done freely and for its own sake. But, it may be asked, why should it be done at all, if God justifies the sinner? With this objection in mind, it is sometimes suggested that God accepts the sinner in order to make him good, since goodness is beyond the sinner's own power to attain; and it is even said that, unless ethical reformation follows, the sinner must forfeit the grace he has obtained when he comes to the Judgment. Present justification is thus in order to sanctification, which becomes the condition of final justification—which takes us back into

legalism! But may it not be supposed that sanctification is the purpose of justification; does not God accept the sinner in order to make him good? The difficulty about this view is that it makes fellowship with God, and even God Himself, a means to an end. It subordinates religion to ethics, which is an even worse offence than that of subordinating ethics to religion, which we noticed above. What, then, is the relation between Christian religion and Christian ethics, between justification and sanctification?

Sanctification and justification must, it is true, never be separated; but they can and must be distinguished. Sanctification is neither the purpose nor the cause of justification, but is rather the result; it is the fruits of faith, the work of grace. Not that entire sanctification is the immediate result of justification. The sinner who is received into fellowship with God is still a sinner, and likely to remain so to the end of his earthly days. He has acquired, it is true, a new motive and a new centre for his life, but the old centre does not disappear forthwith, and he may be described as, in the literal sense of the word, 'eccentric.' He is *simul justus et peccator*, and although he becomes daily more sanctified as his fellowship with God deepens and grows, there is no promise that the goal will be attained in this present world.

If it is asked why the justified sinner should produce these fruits, the answer is because that is the good pleasure of God. The Christian doctrine of justification nowhere suggests that God accepts the sinner in easy tolerance of his sin, but always in spite of it. The very word 'justification' here proves its value, by reminding us that God is, after all, the Judge, who judges us to be sinners, and whose good and perfect will still remains, even though He justifies sinners. It is in the light of this will that we are seen to be sinners at all; that is, precisely in the light of God's good will towards us. The God who justifies the sinner is the God who makes His sun shine and His rain fall on the just and the unjust, who loves His enemies and gives His only Son to die for them. This selfless, self-giving love is what judges us precisely in the act of justifying us; for *we* do not behave like that. It is the righteousness of God, supremely revealed on the Cross. And it is such a love as this, which God has given to us, that He desires us to pass on to others. The ethics of justification might well be summed up in the words: 'Freely ye have received; freely give.'

The Apocalypse: The Book for To-day.

BY THE ARCHDEACON OF BODMIN, CANON W. H. RIGG, D.D., LAUNCESTON, CORNWALL.

THE great challenge of the Christian Church to the age in which we live is the Kingship of Christ. The Kingdom over which He has absolute power is not promoted by physical violence. His rule is within the heart of man. The emblem is not the swastika but the Cross which spells self-sacrifice and service. The homage He exacts is given by free men and His conquests are the conquests of love.

To-day we are witnessing on an unparalleled scale whole nations repudiating the rule of Christ, and whatever may be the attitude of individuals in those countries, their Governments have regarded Christian principles as irrelevant, and framed their policies without any regard for the rights of peoples and races other than their own. In their demand for *Lebensraum*, 'room to live,' they have created a *Todesraum*, that is, 'room to die.' Sometimes openly, often by subtle and underhand methods, they have put all sorts of difficulties in the way of the Christian Church with the object of undermining her influence, their claim being that the State demands absolute and unquestioning obedience on the part of those who belong to it.

For many years I have been in the habit of reading German books, and have also visited that country several times since the last war, having been there twice under the Hitler regime. Well do I remember being at Nürnberg at the time when the news came through of the assassination of Dolfuss, and asking a somewhat Prussian-looking waiter at the hotel where I was staying, 'Is it official?' and his prompt reply, 'Yes, and I am very glad.' On my last visit to Germany in the summer of 1937 my wife and I happened to be staying in Konstanz by the Bodensee (Lake of Constance). We were sitting at one of the tables belonging to a big restaurant by the lakeside. At a table next to us were a husband and his wife with their two young sons from Dresden, and seeing that we were foreigners they began to talk to us. In the course of conversation I overheard my wife giving a very decided 'no' to one of the assertions made by the father of the party. He had made the statement that Hitler was God. Very rightly my wife turned upon him and said, 'How dare you say such a thing!' No one has a right to make such a statement. It is blasphemy. What the bystanders must have thought it is difficult to

say, but in fairness to them it must be added that the mother of the party nodded assent to what my wife said. Perhaps the speaker did not mean to be taken too literally, but at least the words indicate that the Fuehrer or Leader had for his own countrymen a somewhat mystical significance. Nevertheless how does Hitler speak of the Fatherland or the State in his own book, *Mein Kampf*, quoting from the German edition (1933, vol. ii. p. 687). 'In our foreign policy no other consideration should weigh with us than this. Is it of use to our people now or in the future, or will it be harmful to them? Party politics, religion, humanity, all other points of view in general must be put entirely on one side.' We know also that all who hold positions of responsibility must take an oath of unconditional obedience to Hitler. The younger generation has been imbued with the spirit that religion, moral and cultural considerations, home ties, and affections must all be sacrificed to the furtherance of the power and might of the German Reich. Now if the prophet Habakkuk was the book of the Bible for the last war, with far more reason it may be said that the book of Revelation, the Apocalypse, is the book for to-day. The situation confronting the Church towards the end of the first century is somewhat similar to what she is faced with to-day.

In many respects the Roman Imperial Power was very tolerant towards all religions. Since the time of Alexander the Great there had been much interchange of thought between East and West. What are called the Mystery Religions, associated with Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and in Europe with Greece, were flourishing in many parts of the Roman Empire. In one sense they were not at all exclusive, for example, the Egyptian God Osiris was often identified with the Greek Dionysus, or they could be worshipped side by side. What Rome was concerned with was her own political authority, and both before and at the time of the rise of Christianity there grew up the cult of the Roman Emperor, which took place sometimes after his death and sometimes actually during his lifetime. From a religious point of view this did not constitute a difficulty to the majority of peoples belonging to the Roman Empire. Why be troubled about adding another god to the numbers of gods already worshipped! But in the eyes of the Christian

Church this was a very different matter. To One, and One only, could divine honours be rendered, and that was Jesus Christ. Hence to pay divine honours to the Roman Emperor, past or present was to be guilty of idolatry and blasphemy. On the other hand to refuse to worship the occupant of the imperial throne was to render the person or the body to which he belonged hostile to the State. They were politically dangerous and thus under certain emperors became the objects of relentless persecution.

The purpose of the book of Revelation was that the Christian Church should remain steadfast in her allegiance to Christ, King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and in no circumstances whatsoever pay divine honours to any other authority, however strong and powerful it might be. They must, if need be, resist unto death. Those taking part in the triumph of the redeemed were those who have 'come victorious from the beast, and from his image, and from the number of his name' (Rev 15²), 'and they sing the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb, saying, Great and marvellous are thy works, O Lord God, the Almighty; righteous and true are thy ways, thou King of the ages' (v.³). Again and again in the book of Revelation is emphasized the kingship of Christ. In the opening chapter there is the vision of the glorified Christ and in chapter 7¹⁰ the redeemed are described as crying with a great voice, 'Salvation unto our God which sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb.' Towards the end of the book 'the Word of God' is described as having on His garment and on His thigh a name written, 'King of Kings, and Lord of Lords' (19¹⁶). The author of the book is rebuked for falling down and worshipping before the feet of the angel which showed him these things (22⁸), 'See thou do it not: I am a fellowservant with thee and with thy brethren the prophets, and with them which keep the words of this book: worship God.'

In the opening verse of chapter 13 we read, 'And I saw a beast coming up out of the sea, having ten horns and seven heads, and on his horns ten diadems, and upon his heads names of blasphemy.' This beast refers to Imperial Rome, which is made more explicit in 17⁹, 'The seven heads are seven mountains,' the seven hills as it has been observed being a commonplace with the Latin poets. The seven heads have a further meaning attached to them. They are kings, and ten horns likewise refer to those who occupy the imperial throne. Quite likely in the first mention of the Beast the details of this description need not be pressed. The writer goes

on to describe its character (13²), 'and the beast which I saw was like unto a leopard,' that is, the Roman power possessed the catlike vigilance and craft, and ruthless cruelty of pouncing down upon any body of people who called in question its absolute authority; 'his feet were as the feet of a bear,' that is, sometimes it was slow to act, but when it did it moved with a strength and a power which crushed all opposition; 'and his mouth as the mouth of a lion.' When Rome issued her edicts and proclamations like the roar of a lion she struck terror into the hearts of those who might resist her. The Dragon is regarded by John as the Evil One who is making use of the Imperial Power to seek to render those who bear the Christian name disloyal to God and His Christ, and if need be to put them to death.

At the time the Revelation was written there was a widespread legend about the Emperor Nero which John, the Seer, without endorsing makes use of in his book. Soon after his death there was a rumour that Nero was not really dead but lay in concealment. The final shape the story took was that he was dead but that he would return from the nether world. When therefore the Seer speaks of 'I saw one of his heads as though it had been smitten unto death; and his death-stroke was healed: and the whole earth wondered after the beast' (13³; cf. 18⁸), he is referring to the spirit of Nero, who first persecuted the Christians on a large scale, returning in the cruel and implacable Domitian, the Emperor at the time when the last book of the Bible was written.

The Beast coming up out of the earth in v.¹¹ refers to the ministry of propaganda, the chief agents of the Imperial Power or worship being the Asiatic priesthood, and in vv.¹³⁻¹⁷ is a description of the methods of propaganda pursued by them. Dr. Goebbels has had many predecessors. Great wonders are performed by means of jugglery and magic arts, fire even being made to come down (v.¹³). An ancient writer mentions how one of the Roman emperors possessed a machine which could imitate thunder and lightning. Ventriloquism was also used, as the priests would place some one standing inside the image of the emperor bidding the multitudes who gathered round to worship Domitian, 'and it was given unto him to give breath to it, even to the image of the beast' (v. ¹⁵).

Vv.¹⁶ and ¹⁷ describe the measures taken to boycott all those who worship the Beast which in efficiency and thoroughness form an excellent model to the Gestapo.

At the end of the chapter the number of the

Beast is given which in the opinion of many competent scholars refers to Nero, that is the Spirit of Nero came to life in Domitian. Not for one moment do we maintain that there are any secret references to the Kaiser or to Hitler, but principles which governed the attitude of the Roman Empire in their dealings with the Christian Church are the same as those adopted by the Totalitarian countries of to-day. Any power which leaves God out and overrides the Christian conscience or tries to make God subserve the interests of the State, putting the latter above Him, may be regarded as the Beast made use of by the Dragon.

Had we been living in the last quarter of the first century and been neutral observers, we should have laughed to scorn the idea of the Christian Church so small in numbers pitting herself against the mighty power of the Roman Empire. But where is the Roman Empire today? She has fallen, but the Christian Church remains, and the secret of her victory was, and is, Jesus Christ who walks in the midst of the Golden Candlesticks representing the Churches of the Living God. Nothing escapes Him whose eyes are as a flame of fire. With tireless activity, watching, guiding, inspiring, if need be, warning and reproof, He walks in the midst of His Church. Our task is not to be afraid of what may be coming but to be faithful, 'Be thou faithful unto death and I will give thee the crown of life.'

From thoughts like these let us see how best they can be put into practice. There is, of course, their individual application. Clergy and people must make a more complete surrender to Christ. Power is a dangerous gift, and to one, and one only among the sons of men, may all power be granted, namely, Jesus Christ. He should be our absolute Monarch.

Granted this is true, it follows that whatever demands may be made upon us we must not allow His Cause, so far as it has been entrusted to us, to suffer. To the British people has been given the power of colonization, then it follows that to them has been given the special task of spreading the Kingship of Christ. Whatever happens we should not let the work overseas suffer. It is a remarkable fact that the Church Missionary Society and the British and Foreign Bible Society—and there are others besides—were founded when our country was fighting for her and Europe's existence against Napoleon. We are spending at least £3,000,000,000 a year on the war and between three and four millions in Britain on Missions in other lands. Can we who believe in Christ afford to reduce the amount given to Missions in order to make both ends meet?

We need to take long views and be continually looking up to Christ who sits on the throne of God. Whilst active in good works we must possess our souls in patience.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

An Amazing Armada.

BY THE REVEREND CHAS. M. HEPBURN, B.D.,
CRIEFF.

'And there were also with him other little ships.'—
Mk 4³⁶.

A THRILLING event that occurred recently reminded one of a scene in the Bible in the Book of St. Mark. It relates how one evening after their Master had had a hard day the disciples took Him 'even as He was in a ship'—it would be, I expect, a fishing-smack—on the Sea of Galilee to go across to the other side where He might escape awhile from the multitudes and have a rest. And then, adds the

writer, in a simple sentence which most of us scarcely notice—'And there were also with him other little ships.'

And what was the extraordinary event that brought that scene back to one's mind? It was the noble work that was done at Dunkirk by many 'other little ships.' For it was necessary to get away or evacuate our Army from France and for the time being to get it back safely again to England. And the difficulty was how such a vast task was to be done: our Navy with its big ships wouldn't be able to do it alone, for it meant ferrying over to this side nearly half a million men. So an SOS was sent out. A call for assistance flashed round our island, and a large number of 'other little ships,' over a thousand of them, it is said, of

all sorts and sizes and conditions responded at once. It must have been an amazing sight to see the whole motley collection of them—paddle-boats and pleasure steamers, trawlers and tug-boats, barges and motor-boats, Dutch and Belgian as well as British fishing-smacks, and even, I believe, frail canoes, any boat in fact that could steam, or sail, or be rowed, rallied to help in the tremendous evacuation. I don't suppose the English Channel ever saw such an astonishing Armada before, or one which did better work or tackled it with more indomitable courage.

I couldn't help thinking also of the part played in our country's history by many 'other little ships.' Such ships, for instance, as the *Mayflower* in which the Pilgrim Fathers sailed to find liberty for themselves in America, or the gallant little *Revenge* in which Sir Richard Grenville died, and above all those others that assisted in defeating Philip of Spain's 'Invincible' Armada. It consisted of one hundred and thirty vessels, mostly great galleons. Against them the whole Navy of Elizabeth of England was composed of thirty-four smaller ships. Ah, but that was where 'the other little ships' came in, because every merchant and every seaport fitted out whatever craft were available, and these, like a host of tireless terriers, hung on to the tail of Philip's Armada until finally it was driven ashore or dispersed.

And I must say a word, too, about the debt that is due to many 'other little ships.' One is thinking, for instance, of the fishing fleets, of the lifeboat service which has saved so many human lives, and of the whole immense Merchant Navy, larger ships and smaller ones, traders and tankers, and so on, upon whose daring and whose faithfulness we all depend for the most of our food and supplies. Are we always sufficiently thankful for them, for the little ships that these lines immortalize:

Dirty British coaster, with a salt-caked smoke-stack

Butting through the Channel in the mad March days

With a cargo of Tyne coal,

Road-rails, pig-lead,

Firewood, iron-ware, and cheap tin trays.

And isn't there a lesson we may take to ourselves in this, because in this struggle for our Christian civilization that is being so fiercely waged we are like the 'other little ships.' For though we are not in the Navy, or the Army, or the Air Force, we must each of us play our part and energetically do our duty. As the Archbishop of Canterbury said not

long ago to the country we must all say this, 'It all depends on me and I depend on God.' And when we and every little ship do what is, as Nelson would say, 'expected' of us, then surely God will grant us the victory.

Waste.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A.,
ABERDEEN.

'So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.'—Ps 90¹².

Two words have become quite familiar to most boys and girls in recent months, one a long word, the other a shorter—'extravagance' and 'waste.' We are being urged not to use more of certain things than we really need and not to throw anything away which is of some value. Some of us, because of that, are endeavouring, sometimes with a struggle, to do with less sugar in our tea; while others of us who were once careless of papers which we had read, and with which we had finished, have now taken to tying all our papers in bundles and delivering them to those who are collecting such things.

Now why should we be urged to be careful of such things as sugar and paper? The sugar we save will be used for important purposes. The paper which once on a time we might have wasted will now go to make more paper. Knowing that important things which are needing to be done can be done if we are careful, most of us are doing our best not to waste anything.

But is it only of sugar and paper we require to be careful? Some time ago I was reading a new 'life' of Captain Scott, of whom many of you have heard. Scott, says this writer, George Seaver, was careful of everything and, not least of all, of time. Not that he worked continuously. Fond of work, he knew the importance of play. Interested in books, he was equally interested in music. But life was such a big thing, there were so many things to learn and so many tasks to be undertaken. The one thing Scott would never consent to do was to waste time. A sentence in this new 'life' caught my eye and set me thinking about extravagance and waste. 'Delay,' says this writer, 'was (to Scott) an extravagance of time.' To take two days to perform a task which could be performed in one was to be extravagant of time. To idle away an hour in some useless occupation was a waste of time. To put off until to-morrow what could be done to-day was to be careless of time.

Is this a thing of which we are extravagant and

which we waste? The things about which we are careful to-day, sugar, paper, and the rest, are all God's gifts. One of His greatest gifts is what the man who wrote this Psalm called 'our days,' our life. As sugar which we save is used for important purposes, so the time we save can be used to accomplish something important. When we think of what the paper we once wasted might have become are we not set thinking of how our wasted days might have been used?

Some people slouch through life and never come to know many of the beautiful things of which life is full. Others waste time thinking of unpleasant things when they might be using it thinking of pleasant things. Knowing the number of important things to be done with sugar, none of us wants to be extravagant with it. Knowing what can be made of paper none of us wants to waste it. There is much for all to do and much for all to enjoy. All of us desire to be useful and happy. If our desire is to be realized we must not be careless of 'our days,' one of God's greatest gifts to us all.

The Christian Year.

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Variety of Experience.

BY PROFESSOR G. D. HENDERSON, D.D., D.LITT.,
ABERDEEN.

'Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep.'—Jn 4¹¹.

God has the queerest way of doing things: so it must often seem to our limited intelligence. And such times as those through which we are passing deepen the feeling of mystery that attaches to the divine nature and activity. There is plenty to puzzle over.

People sometimes batter themselves hysterically against misunderstandings, like a bird in a room against the glass of a window that is actually half-open. Or they presumptuously tackle problems 'where,' as the old poet Quarles tells us, 'daring venture, oft, too far into't, they, Pharaoh like, are drowned, both horse and foot.' As for the books that try to explain things to us, we might say of so many of them what was said of Butler's *Analogy*: 'We weary of a long journey on foot, especially through deep sand.' The keenly critical and inquiring mind of the writer of the Book of Job can only ask: 'Canst thou by searching find out God?'

We want truth and spiritual peace and spiritual power; and we recognize that something depends

upon the degree of our capacity to respond to experience, and that in the attempt to find out the Almighty unto perfection we tend to see only what we are fit to see. 'Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep.'

I recall an uneasy feeling in Berlin many years ago after hearing magnificent music by Richard Strauss played by an expert and sympathetic orchestra, with the composer himself conducting. He turned and bowed in the usual way, and the crowd clapped excitedly; but one wondered whether there were perhaps in that great Opera House so many as half a dozen who understood what the performance really involved. Was the well-meant applause not largely impertinent? It is not easy to appreciate those greater than ourselves. Even the people with whom we deal in ordinary life we commonly judge by ourselves. Similarly, we make God in our own image, guessing at His purposes according to our miserable standards.

Some of the difficulty may be obviated by training and experience. We can learn from Nature and history. The right kind of culture will help us to find meaning and beauty and truth. We can advance towards peace. We can feel something of the inspiration that promises power. But more is needed; and there is common sense in using the appointed means of coming to know God, the appointed means which the Church provides, regular worship, fellowship with other worshippers, systematically directed thought, study of the Bible, expression of desire in prayer, appreciation of the Sacraments, submission to the influences of music and ritual act and customs of age-long sacred association. Truth and peace and power are all available, and the Church helps to render them accessible.

Religious practices do not, however, invariably satisfy; and people sometimes put the blame upon the religious practices instead of upon their own inadequate response to these. At the same time it is possible for the Church to come short of conveying the truth and peace and power committed to it, and people may be left helpless, unprotected, weaponless in the hour of trial. There have been times in history when organized Christianity has certainly failed, and it is for us to see that it does not similarly fail in our day. We remember the causes of the rise of Islam, and those of the collapse of the Church in Russia. Christian authorities have so often not been Christian.

Can you imagine a person habitually boasting of his acquaintance with the great? You might say:

'I suppose you know So-and-so?' and he could not resist declaring: 'Oh yes, he's a friend of mine.' Yet later you might have the wicked satisfaction of introducing him to that person and exposing the fact that he had never even met him before. He had read the distinguished man's books, perhaps, and had heard gossip about him from persons who did know him, and had come almost to persuade himself that he belonged to that circle. This is a parable. But are there not preachers of that sort, professing Christians of that sort? They claim intimacy with Jesus, but have they ever actually met Him? They have read the Bible, talked much about God, no doubt learnedly or unctuously; but have they ever met Him? Said Bishop Leighton of Dunblane: 'Cold and lifeless, tho' never so fine and well contrived, must those discourses be, that are of an unknown Christ.' Said Jesus: 'Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? . . . and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you.'

We have to know Christ personally, and not just as He is reflected in Nature or books or tradition or other people's experience. That is why at times simple and humble folks know Him better than refined or successful people. The accomplishments of those that seem to be somewhat may put more obstacles in God's way. Sir Isaac Newton was after all the merest of cranks when he opened the Book of Daniel. But God has a way of providing opportunities to which we individually can respond. Our ordinary interests may become the means to fit us for knowing and loving and serving Him, for leading us to truth and peace and power. The Three Wise Men, for example, were very much interested in the stars, were they not? Well, the stars are God's also. By means of their science He brought them to Himself. By a star He led them to the manger cradle to bow their wisdom before that innocence. Or take the story of St. Augustine. He was a teacher of rhetoric, a very capable and a correspondingly self-confident young man. When he went to Milan one of the first things he did was naturally to make his way to the Cathedral in order to hear St. Ambrose, the famous rhetorician and preacher. He went to listen and criticise and if possible catch the secret of this outstanding orator's success. And what happened? It was not rhetoric that he heard. It was the gospel. It was not the manner but the matter that called forth a response from his heart.

There is no experience that may not preach the

gospel to us if we have ears to hear. If we leave the least chink in our black-out arrangements light will use it. Strange experiences, if we permit, will teach us—the loss of friends, worldly disappointment, illness that hampers our helpfulness, circumstances that threaten to destroy our happiness. Strange experiences may teach the world. The tragedies of war may give men and women very precious revelations, may deepen faith, may broaden charity, may turn affections to the things that count. They may lead us to forget self and look to God and set Him in the centre of our universe once more.

God can do it; but we must yield ourselves to His guiding. The truth and peace and power are available; but it is only by eager, expectant surrender that we can obtain control of the proper approach to these. St. Paul prays that 'the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: the eyes of your understanding being enlightened; that ye may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the saints, and what is the exceeding greatness of his power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty power.'

'Sir, thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep.' Yes, the well is deep all right, and the living water will not be reached and obtained without the proper means; but these means are at our disposal—our educated thoughtfulness, our faithful use of the Church and its means of Grace, and our individual humble, consecrated self-surrender to the leading of the Holy Spirit. The eyes of our understanding being enlightened, we shall know the truth, and shall enjoy the peace and shall receive the power.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Indwelling God.

'What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?'—Mt 8³⁶.

In Richard Dehan's book, *Between Two Thieves*, there is a haunting picture which suddenly takes shape before the eyes. It is the picture of old Hector Dunois, one who had made a great figure in his native Switzerland. But men forgot and pitched him upon the shelf of memory. And this is his heart-cry: 'O God, why art Thou keeping me here? I am poor. I am old. I am but a withered branch on Thy tree. O my dear God, when wilt Thou have mercy upon me and take me to Thy breast?'

As his quivering moan died away a swift and lovely radiance filled the room, and a voice of triumph sounded in his ear. And the voice said, 'O loved one, O foolish one, thou art not poor, thou art not old, thou art not forgotten by Me. Thou art My child. Thou art a soul for whom My Son has died.'

I never read that passage without being thrilled. And I know for truth that you are, that I am, that central, finest fact in all God's universe—an immortal soul. And what a redemptive fact it is as well. You are a soul. I am a soul. It means that it doesn't matter a pin's head who you are or what you do or where you stay or what you think about yourself. You are not now, and you have never been in the past, and you never can be in any conceivable future insignificant. On the contrary, just because you are a soul you are a divine person, an everlasting person. You are the man, you are the woman for whom Jesus died.

Lie open, soul, around thee press
A thousand things divine ;
All glory and all holiness
Are waiting to be thine.

But what is the soul? That is the question, and like the gold of King Midas are the answers to it. You cannot count them. Wise people and holy people have lost their sleep and sometimes almost their senses in their attempt to tell us all about it. They have not told us yet. And never will for the reason that the soul is no simple or single thing that you can describe in any off-hand sentence of half a dozen words. The soul, they tell you apologetically, is your real self. It is the true life. It is the higher you. It is the spirit of God sharing Himself with you, housing Himself in the temple of your body, and so on. But put it to yourselves. Do any of these answers satisfy the reason or comfort your doubt? We know they don't, we know they won't—not, at least, as long as the miracle of dawn repeats itself upon a June morning. For, you see, your soul is them all, but your soul is more and greater than them all. And you can always watch the soul at work. Here is a violinist who plays a masterpiece of entrancing music, something by Brahms or another lord of harmony. As he plays his eyes dream. Picture upon picture, murmuring woods, amethyst skies, burns tumbling down the Border hills; seas still under a sunny noon; the crooning of a mother's lullaby in the Isles; sacrifice and love and mirth and the raven of sorrow—these are the scenes which flash before his envisioned eyes. And if we are humble enough we may walk with him

in this wonderland of beauty. It is God living in him who has played that violin. It is God you have been listening to in him craving to be with loveliness and perfection and truth.

Or here is a Cockney sailor, torpedoed in the North Sea, clinging with a companion to the refuge of an oar. Only room for one and here are two. 'You're married, ain't yer?' said the Cockney. The other nodded. Then said the Cockney, 'Good-bye, chum, and God bless yer': and let go and sank. But, children of the Father, don't make any mistake about it. It was God who let go: sank into that pitiless sea. People read about it and remarked across the breakfast table that he was a right brave chap. But the explanation goes a hundred fathoms deeper than that; for in that glorious abandonment of bodily life what happens is that this man's soul, this God-self within him, this divinity under an oilskin, this great gentleman plays up to God. He does what God is doing every hour. He climbs up to the Divine level, and by the dreadful and bitter way of sacrifice he proves to us that love is the mightiest force in the world. So even in a dim way we can see what the soul is, and that it is God's second self living in you and me. It is His voice issuing through our lips. It is His choice flaming into speech and crying: This is eternally right or that is eternally wrong. It is God rising in pity in us, pity for all the broken things of earth. Your soul is your mind seeking the highest, highest truth, highest beauty. It is your vision, the rise of a world in which there shall be happiness for all. It is your will set like flint to make that vision true. But when you have said it, say what you like, but here is the inescapable issue which you've got to face up to. This God-self of mine—this soul of mine—is it alive? Is it functioning? Is it active and vital or is it not?

And the High Soul climbs the High Way,
And the Low Soul gropes the Low,
And in between, on the misty flats,
The rest drift to and fro.

And every man decideth
The Way his soul shall go.

High souls, low souls, drifter souls—that's the division, and which are you in and which am I? You can always test the aliveness of your soul and the test is this. Are you growing in the quality of your thinking: your thinking about God; about your country; about children; about education; about money? Is the sweep of your thought about those things growing gentler and wider and surer?

Are you acquiring the two loveliest habits of character, the forgiveness habit and the self-giving habit? Are you carrying the sunshine of faith and self-conquest with you into your shop or office or factory or bank or school. Are you making your neighbour happy? Are you steadily growing happier yourself? This is the test. And if you can meet the test, then you are beyond question one of the happiest mortals on this planet. For such a one shall see and shall not fear to see the face of God.

In Macaulay's *History of England* there is one immortal chapter describing the trial of old Colonel Rumbold, captured after Argyll's unsuccessful rising in 1686. The mortally wounded man, heavily ironed, utterly forsaken, most utterly forlorn, stands to my thinking for the heroic soul in man. 'You,' said the sneering judge, 'you, sir, are a confounded villain.' At the thrust the old Cromwellian soldier stiffly rose, the jingling of his chains the only sound in the hushed and crowded court. The next moment his spirit leapt into speech. 'Sir,' he flamed, 'I am at peace with God. How then can I be confounded?' So he was victor in that evil hour.

And how can you or I be confounded either? On the surface there seems much to dismay. There are the problems of our time. There are the leaden cares we all carry in our hearts. There is the uncertainty of our children's future. There is the burden possibly of ill-health. But more wounding still, there is the crucifixion of love as when one dear to you passes unreturning through the curtain of mystery. There is the chill knowledge that we must pass through the same curtain, and there is the fact most staggering that we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ. Yet we are not confounded. For He who sits upon the throne of the universe, He loves us and His power to help to our best is equal to His love.¹

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Loving with the Mind.

BY THE VERY REVEREND S. C. CARPENTER,
D.D., DEAN OF EXETER.

'A large upper room furnished.'—Mk 14¹⁵.

There has been in literature some uncertainty about the part played by various organs of the body in the shaping of emotional dispositions. In the poets the affections are commonly seated in the breast, the bosom, or the heart, and in ancient

poetry, both Hellenic and Semitic, as well as in Christian saints and mystics, in other and sometimes rather surprising portions of the human frame. The oddness of this may be dismissed as the crudity of primitive and inaccurate physiology, or it may be praised as an attempt to express the conviction that the body is a sort of democratic community, and that its members all have something like a vote.

There is, however, agreement in distinguishing the intellectual or reasoning faculty from others that we have. We have in the forehead a large upper room, furnished, and with the aid of this processes of reasoning are carried on. The programme for youth can almost be said to be expressed in the words that immediately follow those of my text—'There make ready.'

There is a certain contemporary tendency to minimize the share of the mind in determining conduct. The fundamental instincts have been discovered—twelve of them, though I believe there is a school of thought which, defying superstition, assesses the number as thirteen—and they are often said to have a larger part in controlling our actions than the mind. It is suggested that the mind comes into operation at a subsequent stage and finds belated reasons for the things that we have already decided, or have begun, to do. What ought to be a very splendid term, rationalization, is borrowed and degraded to express this apologetic function.

There is probably more in this idea, that the mind is employed as a counsel for the defence after the deed is done, than some of us suppose, though there is nothing like so much in it as is supposed by others. Yet it remains true that there is a kingdom of the mind, where reason walks as in a garden, and gathers flowers and fruit. For those who are either giving or receiving higher education—and the givers of it would be the first to acknowledge that they also are receiving in their turn—the reason is the supreme instrument. Of course it does not operate alone. No one will become learned or philosophic without some love of learning or philosophy, some moral vigour in the will to learn, and also some of the sort of imagination which can peer forward in promising directions. Dr. John Caird, Master of Balliol, said once of St. Augustine, 'Whatever may be thought of this man's answers, he at least knew how to ask the right questions.' The brilliant intellectual gifts of the man would have remained comparatively barren if his imagination had not been kindled and his faith enlisted when he was led captive by the

¹ A. Maclean, *The Quiet Heart*, 46.

love of Christ. It is certain that whether for saintship, or even for a reasonably complete human life, other qualities not purely intellectual are needed. But with these as helpers a large part of the work is accomplished by the mind.

There is a happy lastingness about the victories of the mind. Ground once gained, and consolidated, is a permanent possession. Desire may wane, but a thing which you have reasoned out remains part of you. I recall a curious instance of this. A friend of mine was being prepared to enter the ministry at a rather more advanced age than is usual. He said to me, 'The lecturer expounds to us the teaching of St. Paul on So-and-so. I listen, and forget. In the examination I am asked what is that teaching of St. Paul on So-and-so. I put down what I think, and behold, it *is* the teaching of St. Paul.' Memory fails with years, but reason is always prepared to begin again.

One of reason's peculiar merits is the power that it has of surveying things as a whole. The desultory mind is prevented by the presence of interesting trees from seeing the wood; the over-imaginative mind wanders down by-paths and gains no conception of the whole. The reasonable mind is not deceived by the superficial or the transient or the irrelevant. It ponders; it experiments; it cuts its losses; it co-ordinates; it comprehends.

A large upper room, furnished. There is one clause in the Commandment which is not always remembered, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God *with all thy mind*.' It is a service which the student is peculiarly qualified to give. It is given in this way. It is given by maintaining a robust and yet delicate regard for truth, by a resolute determination to have no paltering with the standards of right and wrong, a willingness to scorn delights and live laborious days, if thereby the kingdom of truth may be enlarged and the well-being of mankind be increased. To do this is to serve God with the mind. The three values which are called eternal—truth, beauty, goodness—are the three things which do not fade, and behind them, their Source and their Sustainer, is the Eternal God. I have often noticed—and I suggest if you have not noticed this, it may be because you have not been looking for it—that in those who have found or rather have been found by a guiding and inspiring faith in God, the intellectual capacity is quickened. That which was β takes on α quality. The simplicity which, undirected, might have sunk to simpleness, grows into wisdom. Why is it? Because they now see things in a unity. There is a large back-

ground and a creative purpose in their lives. The intellectual power of many comparatively unlearned and ignorant persons who have been led by their Master into the house of understanding has astonished more than one kind of learned Sanhedrin.

The upper room of my discourse is the mind of man. The Upper Room of my text was the room in which a Captain, an Adventurer, declared to a company of bewildered and incredulous disciples that the Kingdom which He had come to establish lay on the other side of His own suffering and death.

They were assembled for a Passover. It was a memorial of an ancient triumph, a ceremony which looked backwards. Moreover their own immediate future seemed to be dark indeed. There must have been strong temptation to think that all was over. The Golden Age was in the past. Let us remember, they thought, the great things that the Lord did for our forefathers in Egypt, let us be thankful for all that we have seen and learned in these three years with our beloved Master here. And then let us resign ourselves to the impending tragedy, and hope at least to have the courage of despair.

The Master—Himself the earthly embodiment of the divine Word or Reason—takes a larger view. The Golden Age is now, as always, in the future. The Bread, the Cup, are pledges of that which is to be. He touches their bewilderment with His own understanding of life's meaning, and transforms the sad memorial to a Eucharist of praise. 'I will no more drink of the fruit of this vine, until I drink it new with you in the kingdom of God.'

Here is faith and hope. But here also is realism of the severest kind. There is a price to be paid. Before that Body of Christ which is Christendom can begin its Christ-work through the world, that Body of Christ, which was the earthly life of the Maker of the Kingdom, must be broken on the Cross.

It is a parable of the life of man. You are eager that your life, your work shall be of profit to mankind. By the help of God it shall be. But it must be dedicated, it must be sacrificed. Not all at once, as at Calvary, but day by day, year by year. The Upper Room where the discipline of education is making ready, must be the scene of resolve and dedication. Then will come the sacrifice, the spending of what the university has made you, in the twin causes that together claim all you have to give, the glory of God and the service of mankind. And so will come, or at least so will come nearer, the Kingdom, and the power and the glory, in earth as it is in heaven.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Tribulation and Peace.

BY THE REVEREND R. C. BROUGHTON, B.D.,
SILVERSTONE, TOWCESTER.

'These things have I spoken unto you, that in me ye may have peace. In the world ye have tribulation : but be of good cheer ; I have overcome the world.'—
Jn 16³³ (R.V.).

One of the few blessings which war has brought to us—especially those of us who belong to the younger generation—is a fresh sense of the hard reality of life. In peace time it is all too simple to acquiesce in an easy, sentimental view of the world. We grow up with the sense that all is well ; progress is inevitable ; peace and goodwill are bound to flourish. In such a soporific atmosphere Pacifism seems a sufficiently sturdy attitude to the ills of the world. But the stern reality of wartime alters all this. In one shattering moment the comforting illusions of life drop from us, and we can see the world as the 'vale of soul making' which it has always been.

1. Yet, if we had closely followed our Lord, need we ever have thought otherwise? He never forecast an easy world for His disciples. He promised no primrose path ; but rather a narrow way into which His followers must 'agonize' to enter. When some imagined discipleship to be an acceptable undertaking, He very earnestly bade them 'count the cost.' He knew that, although He was the Prince of Peace, He would sometimes create 'not peace but a sword.' With the shadow of the Cross now darkening His pathway, He warns His followers that in this world they can expect tribulation as their ordinary lot.

Before this war began we interpreted 'tribulation' as including all the subtle variety of human temptations ; the bitter, personal sorrows of life ; and the general opposition from the spirit of the times. Now 'tribulation' has taken on much deeper shades of meaning. It is coming to mean for us what it meant for the early Christians, who were a minority movement in a definitely hostile world. In our time we have seen the deliberate suppression of Christianity in Russia ; have witnessed a fear-some persecution of vital Christianity in Germany ; are beginning to fear that this blanket of darkness may even descend on us, so that by 'much tribulation we must enter into the Kingdom of God.'

Not for many a generation have we been able to see so clearly this inevitable conflict between the 'world' and Himself, which our Lord must

have had in mind when He spoke of the coming tribulations. In the German Reich, as at present constituted, we have a vivid presentation of what the 'world' is like without the redemptive influence of Christ. Germany has not only enervated what Christianity remains ; she has definitely repudiated Christian ethics. Her rulers laugh at those who would say with St. Paul, 'I glory in my weakness.' 'We have built our State,' they say, 'not on your Old Testament, nor on your chattering about carnal desires, or lust and envy ; we have constructed our State on the immortal and eternally victorious spirit of German life, on the battle spirit of Germany, which does not flinch before its fate.' If we have wondered how they could find men callous enough to perpetrate the horrors of recent months, the answer is because they repudiate the teaching, ethic, and redemption of Christ. They show us the world as it is apart from its Saviour.

In these months of war, the scales have fallen from our eyes. We can understand afresh the inevitable opposition between Christ and the world ; and we cannot fail to comprehend the tribulation which is involved. Few hymns are more appropriate at present than one of John Newton's :

Why should I complain of want or distress,
Temptation or pain? He told me no less ;
The heirs of salvation, I know from His word,
Through much tribulation shall follow their Lord.

2. Yet if the troubles of the present seem darker than before, the assurances of Christ shine brighter than before. 'In the world ye shall have tribulation,' He promises, but adds, 'I have overcome the world.' If His word speaks of conflict, it speaks of conquest too.

Of recent years Professor Aulén of Lund has taken us back to what he considers the 'classic idea' of the Atonement. With scholarship and insight he has shown that the faith of the 'tribulation days' of the Church, and of the later New Testament, was that of 'Christ the Conqueror.'

Surely in our tribulations we need to rejoice in this sublime fact that our Lord is *Christus Victor*. He faced evil in all its manifestations—in temptation, sorrow, sin, death—and He triumphed over all. With lives allied to His, we can share His victory too. Like Paul of old, we may have to suffer 'tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword.' Those

are real possibilities of the present. But we can also add, 'Nay, *in* all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.'

It is this sense of victory even amid tribulation, which can give us peace amid the strife. The contrast Jesus draws is very impressive: 'In the world ye shall have tribulation; in *me* ye may have peace.' As there is a quiet spot in the heart of a cyclone, so amid the tribulations of life,

There is a calm, a sure retreat,
'Tis found beneath the Mercy-seat.

The late C. F. Andrews once spoke to us in college at the time of the Abyssinian war. He had just returned from Geneva, where he told us the representatives of the various countries were distracted and perplexed. But each morning he prayed for a while with the Abyssinian delegate in his room. It was like a calm in the midst of a raging storm. Outside was the rush and bustle of the world; inside was the peace which is in Christ.

3. Finally we note another timely word of Christ's. 'Be of good cheer,' He said; or as Dr. Moffatt finely translates, 'Courage! I have conquered the world.' J. M. Barrie in his own whimsical way called courage 'the lovely virtue.' How greatly we need that lovely virtue just now. Its eternal enemy, depression, takes such heavy toll of those who listen to its seductive voice.

A quaint old legend tells how God sent an angel to the Devil to warn him that God intended to take away all the temptations he employed. The Devil could not argue against such a decision, but he pleaded to be allowed to keep one temptation. 'Let me retain depression,' he begged. The angel could think of little objection to such a mild request, so he agreed. Then the Devil burst into laughter. 'Good,' he said, 'in that one gift, I have secured all.'

As usual, such a legend expresses a profound truth. Depression is one of the Devil's most effective weapons. It robs us of faith in ourselves, in others, and in God. But all who are Christ's need not be victims to so treacherous a foe. They know that even though the cause of evil prosper, yet the ultimate triumph of Christ is assured. They know that nothing has yet happened in this world of which He did not forewarn them. They know that those who trust in Him are courageous conquerors. Even through the noise and din of battle, and despite the tumult and the shouting, they hear that Voice of quiet confidence say to them, 'Courage! I have conquered the world.'

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Cost.

'Which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost.'—Lk 14²⁸.

One of the constantly recurring notes in the teaching of Jesus is the costliness of discipleship to Himself and of entry into what He calls the Kingdom of Heaven. Again and again He warns His hearers that if they would follow Him they must be prepared to give things up, to make surrenders. It would inevitably cost them something. 'Whosoever will come after me let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me.' Perhaps most striking of all are the parables of the hid treasure and the pearl merchant, for in these this note of sacrifice enters almost casually, as though whenever Jesus thought of the Kingdom He inevitably and spontaneously thought of that as well. 'The kingdom of heaven is like treasure hid in a field, the which, when a man hath found, he hideth, and for joy thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath and buyeth that field.' Even when you have found the treasure and been thrilled by the sight of it, it is not yet yours. You must give something in exchange, indeed, give a lot in exchange, all that you have.

This side of the teaching of Jesus, it is needless to say, was not popular with His hearers. But the teaching has not been any easier for later generations to accept. The natural man would like a more genial, a less exacting leader, one who promised as much but asked for less in exchange. Sometimes this criticism of the austerity of Jesus has become vocal, reflective, and argumentative. Swinburne said that the world had grown grey at the breath of Jesus, and others have affirmed that the demands of Jesus are not only too high in fact, human nature being what it is, but wrong in their whole principle and outlook. Why, it is said, all this talk of giving up and of a straight and narrow path? Life is meant to be full and rich and broad, and we are meant to range it in every direction, tasting all we can of its varied experiences, and letting our minds and spirits flow out and grow up freely without the shackles of surrender and prohibition. Some years ago there was a group of thinkers who called themselves 'neo-pagans.' Their teaching was that a man should accept no limitations, but taste every experience which life has to offer, not excluding those experiences which are usually considered degrading and immoral, if such were his inclination. More recently we have had not dissimilar teaching given in some quarters

in the name of what is claimed to be psychology. Don't repress, don't rein in and deny, quieten your surging appetites and desires, not by control and discipline but by satisfying them. Thus shall ye have rest unto your souls !

Let us ask what answer Jesus Himself might make to this kind of criticism of Him. We may surmise, in the light of His other teaching, that He would say at least three things.

First He would say : ' There is surely behind your restiveness under what you call My austerity an illusion about the conditions under which, in any case, you have to live your lives. Here is a man who wants to build a tower. Does he expect to get it for nothing ? Does he dare suggest that he is a favoured one who can have his tower and his money, can eat his cake and have it too ? Well, let him, but you would mock him and call him a fool. And do you expect to have the Kingdom of Heaven on cheaper terms ? '

It is curious indeed, when you come to follow it out, how this principle runs into everything in life, without any exception whatsoever. ' What shall a man give in exchange for his soul ? ' cried Jesus. But that is merely the highest form of a question which you must ask about everything. All life is a question, ' What are you going to give in exchange ? ' Why, the scientists tell us that it is so even on the plane of the lowest physical things. You can only get light by exchanging for it some heat, or heat by expending motion, or radiant energy by losing mass, and so on. You must pay. You must give something in exchange. And the same truth holds in more specifically human things. The amount of energy in a human body and a human soul, and the amount of time in a human life are not unlimited. If you give energy to this thing, you of necessity withdraw it from something else ; if you give time to this thing you of necessity withdraw it from something else. If you want to play cricket like a Hobbs you must give up the idea of playing the violin like a Kreisler, even though you may have the talent for it. If you wish to have the joy of home and family life you must give up the freedom and increasing bank-balance of bachelordom, and accept much worry and responsibility in their place.

As for neo-pagans, anything more ludicrously absurd than their attitude would be difficult to imagine. You cannot taste every experience and see what it is like, for every experience you have cuts out the possibility of others. And as for those who say satisfy every instinct, don't rein and curb and suppress, they, too, are speaking rank

impossibilities. For the whole difficulty is that our instincts and desires war against one another and you can only release one by imprisoning another. You must take sides. You are ambitious to get on, that's one instinct. But you like comfort and ease, and that's another. You like the things of sense, which is a third ; and you have a conscience and an admiration for the heroic life, which is a fourth. How on earth can you satisfy all these things ? It cannot be done. It is not possible to get out of life all that it seems to offer. Many joys will have to be left untasted, many possible experiences unexperienced, many alluring byways unexplored. There is always something to pay.

The second thing Jesus might say is this : ' Does there not lurk within your restiveness under My demands an illusion about your own souls and what will satisfy them ? Dear human souls, ' I can hear Him saying, ' the way of such surrender as I ask looks far more grey and forbidding than it is ever really discovered to be by anyone who sets out upon it. Realize, indeed, that you have to give things up as in every walk of life. Count the cost—you can't avoid cost. But beware lest you count it wrongly. '

There is something here of the highest importance we need to lay hold of. I have noticed that at each important stage of the soul's growth, at every critical point of decision and choice, there is a tendency for this sort of illusion to possess the soul. You cannot move forward without giving up ; but the things you are giving up tend to appear to the best advantage, whereas the things you are to gain hardly appear at all. Thus every step forward in life requires something in the nature of austerity in our own spirits, but, we are to understand, that is not because the stage ahead has not its own rewards to offer ; it is because we are not allowed to see, in advance, what those rewards really are. And this is true of the life, the apparently austere life, to which Christ invites us. Why this should be so I do not know, unless it be that at every point, and not least at the point where He is meeting us savingly in Christ, God would test our real mettle and draw from us a more vigorous manhood !

Finally, Jesus might say this : ' There is surely behind your attitude a lack of a true vision of God. '

Certainly Jesus' demands upon men can never be made to look reasonable to them except in and through the recovery of a very serious sense of God. If men are merely trifling with the idea of God, there will always be something in Christ's

ideals permanently beyond them, permanently baffling both to their minds and to their wills. Religion is nothing if it does not bring a demand of the most absolute kind upon our spirits. When men criticise the austerity of Christ's demands they more often than not merely confess the trifling nature of their religion. They have not seen God. To a man who has seen God no demand can ever be rejected because it asks too much.

Yet there is in Christ's vision of God much more than that. He saw God as One who is not merely inexorably holy but also infinitely giving. And perhaps it is only that vision which can finally drive out the last vestige of criticism of His demands

from our minds. When we have seen God as Christ saw Him, as One who is infinitely austere in His demands on *Himself* for our sakes, One in whose heart is the final self-surrender which we see in the Cross, then to give all, if necessary, for Him will seem not merely a reasonable demand, which we dare not criticise, but a joy and an opportunity which we would not miss.

Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all.

But if it be love that demands, what becomes of demand? ¹

¹ H. H. Farmer, *The Healing Cross*, 45.

Recent Foreign Theology.

British Christendom and British World Dominion.

A QUESTION which is often asked is this: How far are German scholars and thinkers approving and defending the policy of the National Socialist Government, and the ideology invoked as its 'rationalization'? Recognizing that all possible criticism is suppressed and only favourable advocacy is encouraged, it is distressing to find some eminent theologians prostituting their learning as apologists. The latest instance of this conformity of Church to State is one that has given me much pain. Dr. Martin Dibelius is well known and highly esteemed in Great Britain; and his friends here believed that he would be at least quiescent in the conflict of ideologies. But he has openly gone over to the Nazi camp in his pamphlet, *British Christendom and British World Dominion*, one of a series of publications of the German Institute for External Political Research, the character of which can be gathered from some of the titles: 'The Pirate State of England,' 'England fights to the last Frenchman,' 'Bankruptcy of English Economic Policy,' 'Cant, the English Form of Hypocrisy,' 'England as Usurer,' 'England the Reactionary.' These facts are stated and a review is offered of Dr. Dibelius' contributions by Dr. Arthur Frey, author of a book on the Church controversy, entitled *Cross and Swastika*, in an article in *Kirchenblatt für die reformierte Schweiz*, 16th May 1940.

Of this article I here offer a summary. Dr. Frey states that, although the conformity of the Church

to the State is not complete, yet the opposition of even the Confessional Church has grown more feeble and hopeless, not only because the State oppression has assumed draconic severity, but also because a large section of the Church has resolutely, even enthusiastically, lent its support to the policy of conquest of the State, as if it were a matter, regarding the goodness and righteousness of which no kind of doubts were possible. Although in my review of Dr. Frey's book I offered the criticism that, as a disciple of Barth, his judgment of German Lutheranism was too harsh; yet much that I have learned since, and especially this pamphlet of Dr. Dibelius, would seem to confirm his view.

A prominent trait of the Englishman, according to Dr. Dibelius, is that he is a hypocrite: the presuppositions of the remarkable English piety which so confuses Church and world, faith and life, are Calvinism and Puritanism. Calvin, unlike Luther, sought to recreate all in State and Society according to Biblical standards, and as the New Testament contains no social doctrine, he turned to the Old Testament and the legal order of the people of Israel: two features of his teaching had special importance for England—the new self-consciousness of the reformed Christian people as God's elect, and the new self-discipline of congregation and individuals in it. The order of the Church was conformed to New Testament teaching as then understood. To Calvinism and Puritanism must be added the Christianity of religious revival, in which Methodism is central, three features of which have special significance—enthusiasm, the art of propaganda,

and possession of the masses. He admits that the life of the Englishman is more potently influenced by the Church than that of the German, but this discloses only a primitive understanding of the Old and the New Testaments. Puritanism is marked by its legalisms, based on the Old Testament, the provisional character of which is not recognized; nor are the demands of Christian life derived, as in the New Testament, from the Christian's new status as redeemed. As God's glory is the supreme principle of this legalism, to act for God's glory is piety. So far objection need not be taken to his historical analysis.

The Protestant of the Lutheran type trusts to justification by faith, and not works, and thus escapes the peril of Pharisaism. The Calvinist does not seek merit as does the Pharisee, and yet he wants to proclaim God's glory in his doing and thus runs the greater risk. The revivalist theology encourages emotionalism, indignation against wrongs, and compassion for the wronged, sympathy and succour for the suffering. So far so good; but here is the practical conclusion. These Calvinistic virtues, and this emotionalism, have all served as a foundation for British world dominion, as religious emotions are easily diverted to political ends. The Englishman's pride of Empire finds its justification in his consciousness of election and vocation. Even foreign missions are disguised imperialism. Dr. Dibelius almost gives the impression that not only does English piety lend support to this imperialism, but it is this false religion which has driven England along this path. 'The Englishman borrows the cloak of religion to disguise his aims, but he forgets that he thereby seeks to unite what cannot be united and that God's rule is not British rule.' Perverse as may appear this caricature of our Christianity it challenges us to

self-scrutiny to discover what in our words and deeds lends any countenance to it.

Dr. Dibelius attempts also, in contrast, to set in clear light and to justify German Lutheranism. He defends the dualism of the life in grace and the life in the world, the separation of economics and politics with their autonomy from the demands of the Christian ideal of the Kingdom of God. One sentence will suffice. 'The statesman must, if he is a Christian, rely on his Christian conscience and the grace of God, and does not need to justify his necessary decisions by a Christian tradition. And the Church stands unburdened by responsibility for onerous and perhaps ambiguous decisions.' Can a conscience be Christian that has no regard to Christian tradition? Can a Church be Christian that recognizes no obligation to be the purifying and elevating leaven in the meal of society? The question Christendom is asking the German Church is thus answered. All the wrongs and miseries the German Government is inflicting on the small States is no concern of the Church! 'This alibi,' says Dr. Frey, 'will save the German Evangelical Church from no judge.' He concludes truly that in seeking to tear the mask from English Christianity Dr. Dibelius has laid bare the irresponsibility of German Lutheranism in face of world occurrences.

Many in Great Britain were cherishing the hope that the churches here and in Germany might find enough common Christian ground on which to build a new and better world order. Is this, too, one of the 'illusions' which German Lutheranism is going to expose as English hypocrisy? It is no pleasure, but a grief to me, to write this article, but it seems a duty, so that we cherish no 'illusions' about German Lutheranism.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

Sankey the Singer.

BY THE REVEREND E. EBRARD REES, STACKSTEADS, BACUP.

IRA DAVID SANKEY was born in Edinburgh, Pennsylvania, U.S.A., on 28th August 1840.

No singer of sacred songs and solos has thrilled so many congregations and moved them emotionally to the extent that Sankey did. When he died his voice continued to vibrate and echo and it

does still in not a few sects all over the English-speaking world. Sankey survives in his songs. He made them channels of blessings while he lived, and though dead he still speaks. Sankey has survived through his songs longer than any other religious singer so much of himself was in them.

Each song became the expression of himself just as the painting becomes that of the artist or the ode of the poet.

Blind though he was during the last five years of his life, and troubled on many sides, he sang to the end; sang to twos and threes the songs that had moved congregations of thousands. Many others had better voices than he, but Sankey added passion, emotion, will, and a deep religious feeling to his. In consequence he was at his best when in adversity or up against difficulty. He could not only silence a hostile congregation a moment or two after beginning to play his harmonium, but when he began to sing he could make that crowd friendly not only to himself but to the Master he served. Difficulty, opposition, and trouble gave Sankey his greatest opportunities and triumphs. His first contact with Moody was at an early morning Easter service that was as dead as bones. Moody could get no sign of life. When the meeting was nearly over Sankey arrived and was asked to sing. Two or three notes of the hymn 'There is a fountain filled with blood' were sufficient to put flesh on the bones and the whole place was electrified with emotion.

From that day at Indianapolis Moody and Sankey were married vocationally, the former preaching, and the latter singing, the gospel in America, Great Britain, and Australia. Sankey bore the brunt of every attack. Time and time again the evangelists arrived at a city or hall or church where there was hostility or apathy. It was Sankey who had to face the coldness, and with his voice had to make a way for the preacher to have a hearing. If he did not always get home the message in song, he made it much easier for Moody to do so after him.

Opposition came from two sides. The world hated Sankey because he took their castle with song. Evangelists were having an uneasy time in those days at the hands of gangs of roughs organized by publicans and others. Just as keen, if more polite, was the opposition of the Orthodox members of churches. To them Sankey's tunes were like jazz to the ears of the musical highbrow a decade ago. Sankey's tunes jarred and jolted. He was a revolutionary; he was heterodox. His theology was judged by his music. 'Cheap music and cheap theology' was one of the jibes against him.

But criticism only spurred Sankey to greater

song. He saw his singing winning people into confession of Jesus as Lord. It got results when the sombre singing of his Scottish Church critics got nothing. His singing converted people. It mattered nothing to Sankey that theological professors criticised his lack of theology. He knew that there was enough theology in his solos to make a bridge for sinners to cross over into a world of calm and peace.

There was no depth or breadth in his own hymns or those of others he sang. His chief songs, 'Trusting Jesus,' 'Yet there is Room,' 'A Shelter in the time of Storm,' and 'Rescue the Perishing' have little theology in them. Their greatness lies in their simplicity and absence of profundity. Sankey did not sing to the head. What his critics forgot was that music reaches the listener through his emotions and not through his reason. Once the reason blocks the way emotion is held in check; but once emotion is captured then the whole citadel of the personality is down. Sankey had learned this lesson early in life. When he was a soldier in Lincoln's Army he did no soldiering, but spent his time teaching choirs to sing 'The Boys in Blue' and other songs that were popular in those days. Before he joined the Army and afterwards he trained chapel choirs; and through these years he learned that the best way to capture a personality is to do so emotionally. That was his method and secret. And it worked in three continents.

Not only did Sankey sing songs himself. He taught others to sing them. At his portable organ and with his own voice as lead he would teach a crowd as many as six or eight hymns in an evening. The next day the whole town was singing them. Thus it was that his collection of 'Songs and Solos' became a best seller. Indeed, it has remained a best seller, for no other book, apart from the Bible, has sold so many copies as Sankey's 'Songs and Solos' in all the editions.

Many thousands of older Christians all over the world make some of Sankey's hymns their altar. Well they might. It is their shelter in a time of storm. What the effect of Sankey's hymns will be on the final hymnody of the Church none can say, but they introduced a lighter tune into the song of the Sanctuary. That will remain his contribution. A lilting chorus is a vehicle of thought even in Church.

Entre Nous.

Percy Dearmer.

A man of many sides like Percy Dearmer makes an ideal subject for a biography. But the interest and excellence of *The Life of Percy Dearmer* (Cape; 10s. 6d. net) is also to be attributed to the fact that it has been written by his wife, and so we have an intimate picture of the man, full of personal touches, and yet at the same time we have a curiously impartial account. For Mrs. Dearmer has been able to stand, as it were, a little distance away and from it has surveyed P. D. and his work. Nan Dearmer was Dr. Dearmer's second wife, marrying him in 1916. But she had known him from her childhood. There is an Introduction by the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews. 'No one,' he writes, 'could be five minutes with Percy Dearmer without realizing that he was a man of great originality.'

Dr. Dearmer was born in London on 27th February 1867. He seemed to owe little to his heredity. His father was not distinguished and his mother was an erratic person, who took little interest in her younger son. He went to Oxford as an ardent Conservative and a member of the Primrose League but it was not long before he turned to Labour. There he was influenced by Gore and his thoughts turned from Law to the Church. Joseph Clayton, speaking of the early days at Oxford, says: 'Stewart Headlam, with his Guild of S. Matthew, inspired for us the gospel of Christian Socialism and presented the Church of England as the instrument for its achievement. Socialism for P. D. meant more than economic change. It meant opening the kingdom of art and beauty to all. He was never an Anglo-Catholic theologically. His love of beauty made him appreciate Anglican ceremonial, but he was always "broad" and he was repelled by "Roman" doctrine.' He was one of the first members of the Christian Social Union and worked with Scott Holland on the *Commonwealth*. In October, 1891, he wrote to Gore: 'I am awfully hopeful though, because the one remedy that has been carefully avoided, Democracy, is about to be tried—humanity is going to give humanity a chance at last. What a splendid age to live in! . . . I am very happy.'

In 1891 he was appointed to the Curacy of St. Anne's, South Lambeth. In 1900 he became Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin, Primrose Hill, and there he had the opportunity of working out all the teaching he had given in the *Parson's Handbook*, which was to make liturgy attractive to the

Church, stressing the necessity of the co-operation of the Church with great artists and craftsmen.

He influenced the Church very considerably also by his reform of hymns and hymn tunes. 'With others concerned, he set to work upon the *English Hymnal*.' There was included in this hymnal many little known but great hymns of literature, such as 'John Bunyan's "He who would valiant be," Blake's "To Mercy, Pity, Peace, and Love." Whittier's "Immortal Love," and "Dear Lord and Father of Mankind," John Donne's "Wilt thou forgive," John Milton's "The Lord will come and not be slow."'

During the war he resigned from Primrose Hill and offered his services with nursing units in Serbia. This was followed by a period of work in India and America, and then in 1919 he returned to England. He was soon appointed Professor of Church Music at King's College, but, apart from that, he was entering upon a difficult period, when it became more and more apparent that the Church authorities were not to make use of his services. He held no further Church appointment until 1931 when, under the Labour Government, he became Canon of Westminster. In the Introduction writes Dr. Matthews: 'I think we may say that no other church in Christendom could have produced a man like Dearmer or, having produced him, could have kept him in her fold. . . . But we must not flatter ourselves too much. We held him, but did we make the best use of him? I scarcely think so. There is only one touch of sadness in this life, whose dominant note is that of "joy and health": it is the feeling that these great gifts were for many years given no adequate sphere for their exercise.'

It was during this period that the Guildhouse experiment with Miss Royden was tried—an experiment in the more vivid sense of fellowship amongst Christian people.

In view of Dearmer's work in beautifying the services of the Church—his interest in ritual—what Harold Anson, to whom he talked freely, states was his attitude to the Eucharist is of special interest. 'The Eucharist meant for him the gathering of neighbours in a friendly meal, filled with the sense of Jesus present, as the true leader of men, wherever, and in whatever cause they met. He cared intensely that such a meal should be surrounded by all that was beautiful in colour, in music, in ceremony; but it was not as a *substitute*,

but as a *focus*, for the common meals in which neighbours met to affirm their mutual love, and their mutual discipleship.'

Some of his Sayings.

'I know perfectly well why I personally became a Christian. It was because I felt that the world is extremely beautiful, but eminently unsatisfactory.

'Christianity, with its main principle of the spiritual informing the material, alone seemed to present a sane, simple and comprehensive system. Christianity alone offered a religion which the man of the world could accept, and a worldliness which no saint could afford to ignore.'¹

'(Apropos of the Exhortation at the end of the Marriage Service): "We really ought not to set up a regular polygamist like Abraham as an example to young bridegrooms."

"A man can dance to the glory of God, a man can make love knowing that he is fulfilling a Divine purpose, but he cannot gamble to the glory of God."

"Christianity is like radium—seldom found in pure form."²

C. F. Andrews.

Mr. John S. Hoyland was just reaching the last pages of his manuscript on C. F. Andrews when the news came to him of Andrews' death in Calcutta (4th April 1940). *C. F. Andrews, Minister of Reconciliation* (Allenson, 3s. 6d. net), is in no sense a biography of Andrews, but rather a study of his life and teaching, written in fullest sympathy. As a young man Hoyland went out to India as a Quaker missionary. He arrived in India in 1912, and his first months were spent with Andrews, then himself a missionary professor in St. Stephen's College and an Anglican clergyman. From this time they never lost touch with each other.

The main principle behind Andrews' conception of reconciliation was his belief in the extension of the principle of the Incarnation, in the sense of self-identification with the needs and problems of the poorest. His was a ministry of Reconciliation through Friendship. He was much influenced by Tagore's thought. 'Whom dost thou worship in this lonely dark corner of a temple with doors all shut? Open thine eyes and see thy God is not before thee! He is there where the tiller is tilling the hard ground and where the pathmaker is breaking stones. He is with them in sun and in shower, and his garment is covered with dust. Put off thy holy mantle, and even like him come

down on the dusty soil. . . . Here is thy footstool and there rest thy feet where live the poorest, and lowliest, and lost.'

Andrews had an unshakeable belief in men. He was confident that somewhere in every man there was hidden an element intensely worth while, and it was to this 'Divine Witness' that he appealed.

Following his year at Woodbrooke and journeyings to different parts of the world, where he felt that distress was most acute, Andrews settled for a short time in Cambridge, and there he developed his idea of a new foreign policy under a Minister of Reconciliation. His task would be 'to mobilize good-will and to send groups of Franciscanly-minded people to other countries.' 'Just as St. Francis,' Mr. Hoyland writes, 'sent out his little groups of young people, over a war-torn world, to build creative peace by working with their hands, without pay, on the fields of impoverished peasants, or for the suffering lepers in the leper-houses, so later on C. F. Andrews was to inspire the sending out of very numerous similar teams (in 1939 there were, for instance, at least two hundred of these teams known to have been at work in England alone).' There is no suggestion that Andrews initiated this type of social service—indeed he was greatly influenced himself by one outstanding example. This was the work done in the earthquake area of Bihar by a team working under the Swiss internationalist, Pierre Ceresole. 'Where there is one man, or a tiny group of men, willing to go the whole way in obedience to the guidance of the Spirit of good-will and service, miracles of reconciliation can be brought about.

'One such miracle, on this occasion, was the fact that the British Government in India and the Indian National Congress, which up to a few months before had been an outlawed and proscribed body, co-operated in supplying Rs. 50,000 each for the purchase of land and building materials for the new villages. It is extremely rare for these two great bodies to do anything together. They are exceedingly restive bed-fellows even at the best of times.'

But although Andrews was not the founder of work camps, it was his enthusiasm and example that kindled enthusiasm in others and brought about their extension on a large scale so that they were held in Spain (under war conditions), Norway, Italy, France, Denmark, Sweden, Ireland, Holland, Germany, and in the U.S.A.

One of the last and one of the most interesting of the chapters—in view of conditions to-day—gives an account of the work done by a team of

¹ P. 82.

² P. 294 f.

English who went to Germany in August, 1939, to co-operate with a team of Germans in the improving of a Youth Hostel at St. Goar. 'We found,' he says, 'as on so many previous occasions, that the mere fact of working arduously together for the sake of other people, possesses in itself an extraordinary power of creating friendship.' But again, 'It may as well be said here that we made no discernible impression on this pre-conditioned mentality in our work-mates. They were, so to speak, fool-proof, from the Hitler Jugend point of view.'

Proving One's Love.

'I felt it a duty and a privilege to try to show to India, by working in a small but crowded corner of that great country, the one power which alone can give true peace to individuals and to nations, the one means by which conscience can be aroused to condemn social evils and to try to get rid of them. I had two priceless gifts to offer to India—surgery and Christ. I had already seen a little of the effects of ignorance and superstitions on the sufferings caused by injury and disease. I had the means of alleviating and curing by humane and scientific methods. But more than all that, I had a vision—a dim and imperfect vision, as all our imaginings must be until we see "face to face"—of some of the things Christ could do for India. Could I in some small way show something of the love of God, and inspire others to do the same?'¹

Whole Time Service.

'A man said to me, "Sir, we want a new missionary at —." "What for?" I replied. "You have got — there." "No good" is all he said in answer. I knew that the missionary in question was keen on the work and liked the people, and was surprised to hear this from a man of good character, who I knew was involved in no quarrel or grievance against the missionary or his society. So I asked, "Why do you say 'No good'?" The devastating reply was: "He is always kind if you talk to him, but at time of drought when people all around were half starving for lack of water they asked him for permission to draw water from his bungalow well. He refused. It is no good to have a person like that talking to us about Jesus Christ."'²

Jeremiah xii. 5.

'We have other evidence of the delicate spiritual perceptiveness of Jeremiah, but none more im-

pressive than this: that somehow it was borne in upon him that God's answer to all his questioning resentment was simply a call to a more strenuous and difficult conflict than that through which he had just passed. He had asked for consolation, for a justification of the ways of God to men, for vengeance on his enemies; he received a ringing summons to still more arduous tasks. "If thou hast run with the footmen, and they have wearied thee, then how canst thou contend with horses?" It is a fine metaphor. "Pull yourself together," God seems to say. "What you have just passed through is to what yet lies before you, as a race with footmen is to a race with horses. This is but the beginning of your battles for truth and self-mastery, a mere preliminary skirmish, and here you are wasting your time and energy in self-pity and childish vindictiveness!" Jeremiah's great soul responded to the challenge: indeed only a great soul, capable of responding to it, could ever have heard it.'³

Ye did it unto Me.'

At Santiniketan, which lies in the depth of the country, I was right away from any Church. My dearest friend, Susil Rudra of Delhi, was staying with me. His son was about to go out to France in order to do ambulance and hospital work. He said to me, 'Sir, I wonder you do not miss the Holy Communion.' Quite instinctively, I pointed to the boys in front of me and said, 'These are my Holy Communion.'

After he had returned to India he came to me one day and told me that the words I had said before he left for France had remained with him all through the months when he was tending the sick and the wounded out there at the Front. When he had to keep up his strength of will, in order to give his very best to the wounded and dying in their agony, he used to say to himself, 'Here is my Holy Communion.' It was no mere sentiment. He saw Christ in the midst of all the human suffering when it was at its very worst. He heard the voice of Jesus saying, 'Ye did it unto Me.'⁴

³ H. H. Farmer, in *The Christian World*, 4th July 1940.

⁴ C. F. Andrews, *The Good Shepherd*, 127.

¹ T. Howard Somervell, *Knife and Life in India*, 18.

² *Ibid.*, 271.